LALA LAJPAT RAI

WRITINGS AND SPEECHES

VOLUME ONE

LALA LAJPAT RAI
WRITINGS AND SPEECHES

VOLUME ONE
1888-1919

EDITED BY
VIJAYA CHANDRA JOSHI

UNIVERSITY PUBLISHERS
DELHI — JULLUNDUR

LALA LAJPAT RAI
WRITINGS AND SPEECHES

PUBLICATION SPONSORED BY
THE LAJPAT RAI CENTENARY COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITY PUBLISHERS
Railway Road, Jullundur
Mori Gate, Delhi-6

First Edition 1966

Price : Rs. 25.00

PUBLISHED BY O. P. GHAI, PROPRIETOR, UNIVERSITY PUBLISHERS
AND PRINTED AT YUGANTAR PRESS, MORI GATE, DELHI-6.

FOREWORD

THOUGH titled as one, this is no foreword. I intend this to be my humble tribute to Lala Lajpat Rai, one of our top most leaders.

In these crisis-ridden days my thoughts automatically go back to those two qualities which were so characteristic of Lala Lajpat Rai and which the country needs so badly today. They were his undaunted courage and extreme self-reliance.

From very humble beginnings, and in face of great adversity, Lalaji developed a unique personality, a keen intellect, great erudition and unchallenged social and political leadership, all by dint of his own ceaseless efforts.

Challenges could never tame him. Physical hardships, imprisonment and exile only helped to strengthen his resolve and steel his determination to achieve political independence and social and economic regeneration of his country.

He was endowed with a great vision and a large heart. He sought independence for his country because he believed in freedom and dignity of man. But there was no rancour in him and his friends were spread around the world, even in England whose imperialism he fought tooth and nail.

His intellectual qualities and sensitivity also enabled him to see political independence for India in its proper perspective. He knew that without social justice, and without upliftment of the masses and the downtrodden, political freedom would have no real meaning. But with him they were not merely political shibboleths or bare intellectual convictions. He could not even wait for realising these social ends till freedom was won. In his own life time he was in the vanguard of every movement for social and religious reform. He knew the value of action which he not only preached but always practised.

He appreciated the need to strengthen Indian economy to use it as a tool for the advancement of our political and social objectives. He also realised that a proper modern education in tune with our ancient heritage was necessary for grooming young people to serve the country. Lalaji was truly great.

LAL BAHADUR

Prime Minister's House,
New Delhi,
December 27, 1965.

PREFACE

NO APOLOGY is required for the publication of this selection from the writings and speeches of Lala Lajpat Rai, an eminent leader of Indian nationalism. Since his death in 1928, hardly anything has been published on his life and work. His books have all gone out of print and his valuable articles and speeches, scattered among numerous old newspapers, periodicals and journals, are not easily available. The result is a complete lack of understanding, even among the educated classes, of the basic ideas and ideals for which Lajpat Rai stood. It has, therefore, been considered desirable to bring out a representative selection from his writings and speeches. To understand and appreciate his many-sided personality, his ideals and his views on diverse problems—political, economic, social, religious and educational—there is no better material than Lajpat Rai's own writings. These possess rare qualities of sincerity and frankness and thus furnish a true picture of the man in his own words.

The two volumes now being published contain Lalaji's writings and speeches from 1888 to 1928. An attempt has been made to incorporate in these the most significant material pertaining to his varied interests and activities. The task of selection has, however, been a difficult one because of the enormous amount of material that is available and the limitation of space in the publication. It has not been possible to include in these volumes even some of the important articles and speeches.

The speeches and writings selected for publication have been reproduced in these volumes in full and in their chronological order. It is not feasible to provide a subject-wise classification without breaking the individual contributions into several bits according to their subject content. A biographical essay on Lajpat Rai has been provided to help the readers in the appreciation of his writings in different phases of his eventful career. It is not just a short narrative of the significant events of his life in chronological sequence. An effort has been made in it to bring out the influences on the evolution of Lalaji's personality and ideas and his views on

significant developments with which he was connected. The notes given in each of the two volumes amplify some of the points in the text and provide supplementary information relevant to the subjects under discussion.

I owe a debt of gratitude to the Lajpat Rai Centenary Committee for sponsoring this publication and providing generous financial assistance in the collection of the material for the volumes. The Committee's President, the late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, evinced great interest in the progress of the work and he wrote for it a 'Foreword' only a week before his departure for Tashkent. The sad news of his tragic death at the moment of his personal triumph came before the printing of this work could be completed.

My thanks are due to the authorities of several institutions and libraries who provided generous facilities in the compilation of this work. Among them, to name a few, are the National Library, Calcutta ; the National Archives of India, New Delhi : Library of the Indian Council of World Affairs, New Delhi ; Central Secretariat Library, New Delhi ; Library of the Lok Sevak Mandal, New Delhi ; Dwarka Das Library, Chandigarh ; the India Office Library, London ; the British Museum, London and the New York Public Library, New York. The Editors of *The Tribune* and the *Hindustan Times* have allowed the use of the old files of their papers.

For assistance in the making of this work I am indebted to Sewak Raj Mahajan. He has been associated with it throughout the period of its preparation—from the time of the initial search for materials to the final stages of its production. But for his help and collaboration it would have been difficult to bring out this publication.

V. C. JOSHI

New Delhi.
January 28, 1966

CONTENTS

LALA LAJPAT RAI—AN INTRODUCTION

LALA LAJPAT RAI was born on 28 January 1865 in the village of Dhudike, in Ferozpur district. The day which saw the birth of this eminent leader of Indian nationalism came thirty years after Thomas Babington Macaulay wrote his celebrated educational minute. It fell about twenty-one years before the day when seventy-two "leading politicians well acquainted with the English language" met in Bombay, on 26 December 1885, to lay the foundation of the Indian National Congress. Macaulay's minute set at rest the controversy between the Orientalists and the Anglicists regarding the Government's educational policy in respect of higher learning. The Governor-General, William Bentinck, accepted Macaulay's views and issued a resolution on 7 March 1835, declaring that "the great object of the British Government ought to be the promotion of the European literature and sciences amongst the natives of India and that all funds appropriated for the purpose of education would be best employed on English education alone." Bentinck's decision was a turning point in the history of India. It enabled a large number of Indians to have access to European thought and literature and brought them under the powerful influence of English liberalism and Western scientific thought. During the next half century Western education made rapid strides, with the result that a new class of English educated Indians, distinguished by their special interests and group solidarity, emerged in India. They also became politically articulate once they had imbibed the ideas of Western liberalism and nationalism. Western education created a powerful sentiment of nationality among the educated class ; this sentiment was fostered by the new English and vernacular press and the growing network of railways. Many factors combined to inspire national awakening in India, but the most potent force that brought about this change in India was the impact of English education and Western culture. Among the seventy-two gentlemen who attended the first Congress at Bombay, the large majority were lawyers, teachers and journalists, all products of the new educational mill.

In the Land of Five Rivers English education came a little late because the province was annexed to the British dominion only in

the middle of the nineteenth century. Some members of the professional classes in the region availed themselves of the opportunities which could be availed for receiving education at Calcutta ; but it was only after the establishment of the Punjab University College at Lahore, in 1869, that an appreciable number of them could fully benefit from the system of education promoted by Macaulay's countrymen. Lajpat Rai belonged to the first generation of English educated Punjabis. English education and study of European literature brought about a decisive change in his ideas and he acknowledged its unifying influence in the country. 'A common system of (English) education', he said in 1912, addressing a conference of Arya youngmen, 'has brought about a feeling of community of interests in different provinces of India and has materially helped to strengthen the national feeling.'[1]

2. INFLUENCE OF PARENTS

Munshi Radha Kishan, Lajpat Rai's father, an Agarwal by caste, was born on 18 December 1845, the day the British defeated the forces of the Lahore Durbar in the battle of Mudki. The family belonged to Jagraon, a small town in Ludhiana district which came into British possession in 1846. Radha Kishan did not have an opportunity of receiving English education, but he attended the vernacular school opened by the Government in his home town. He was a brilliant student and always stood at the top of his class. He qualified as a teacher of Urdu and Persian at the Normal School at Delhi and joined the educational profession at a meagre salary of Rs. 25 per month. Radha Kishan was an ideal teacher even though he did not receive his training in English ; the art of teaching came to him naturally. He taught his students like comrades and enjoyed their company. In 1920 Lajpat Rai wrote about his father, "He gave the best in him to his pupils, not in the spirit of giving but in a spirit of co-operation. Wherever he went he was the idol of his pupils."[2] Lajpat Rai received his education entirely from his father, except in English, until he passed the middle school examination and joined High School at Lahore. The keen interest which he showed in education in later life was due in a large measure to the influence of his father.

1. *Lajpat Rai—Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 186.

2. Lajpat Rai, *The Problem of National Education in India*, (London, 1920) p. 10.

Unlike most vernacular school teachers of his class, Munshi Radha Kishan had deep interest in learning, particularly in the study of religious literature and history. He was a vociferous reader and a writer in Urdu of considerable merit. Lajpat Rai owed to him his habit of study and burning desire for self-expression.

Though a member of an orthodox Agarwal family Radha Kishan was much attached to Islam due to the influence of his Muslim teacher in school. He hated his ancestral faith and was a Muslim except in name. A great admirer of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, Munshi Radha Kishan regularly read his writings and belonged to his school of thinking. Lajpat Rai too came under this influence in his early life. His upbringing under the care of his father was virtually Islamic. Under the influence of Arya Samaj Lajpat Rai rejected Islam, but his interest in the reform of Hinduism bore the impress of his father's Islamic predilections. Lajpat Rai's mother, Gulab Devi, came from a family in which Sikhism was in favour. She was an orthodox Hindu in spite of her husband's erratic religious beliefs and was deeply devoted to him and her children. Gulab Devi was illiterate but she was known for her thrift and managing well the household despite the meagre income of her husband. Lajpat Rai's life was much influenced by her too. The basic spiritual qualities of his character and genius for constructive work were inherited from his mother.

3. EDUCATION

Lajpat Rai was a bright student in school but his weak constitution and ill-health in childhood interfered with his studies. The indigent circumstances of the family proved to be another hindrance in the way of his receiving higher education. In 1880, he took the Entrance Examination of the Calcutta University as well as that of the Punjab University College. He passed both the examinations; the Calcutta University Examination in the first division and in the Punjab Examination securing fifty-third place in a list of 106 successful candidates.

Despite his meagre income Munshi Radha Kishan wanted his son to receive university education. Accordingly Lajpat Rai joined, in February 1881, the Government College at Lahore – the only College in the Punjab at that time—in the Intermediate Arts class. He also joined the Law School. But he had to leave studies within

two years of joining the college mainly because of the family's poor means. He failed in the first year examination of the Intermediate class, but in 1883 he passed the first law examination which enabled him to obtain a licence for practising as Mukhtar. He left his studies and settled at Jagraon, his home town, to earn his living. Three years later he passed the Pleaders' Examination, having failed twice earlier. It is remarkable that Lajpat Rai was one of the few nationalist leaders of his generation who did not have the distinction of being graduates of universities. In the case of Lajpat Rai, what he lacked in formal university education he made up by self-study. In fact his thirst for knowledge was never satisfied and to the end of his life he continued to be a vociferous reader.

4. NEW RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS

The sojourn at Lahore for two years was of vital import in moulding the ideas and life of the young student from Jagraon Lajpat Rai was barely sixteen when he arrived in the metropolis of the Punjab, quite oblivious of the fact that the city was to play an important role in his later career. Arriving there at an impressionable age, he was exposed to the influences of the men and movements of those days. Lahore was the centre for varied public activities and offered to him, like other earnest youngmen, a valuable opportunity of acquiring a wider outlook upon life. The new Hindu socio-religous reform movements, born out of the impact of English education and Western culture, had found their way to Lahore before his arrival there. The atmosphere of the city was charged with the spirit of public discussion and debates, in which young college students were often actively involved. Brahmo Samaj was founded in Lahore in 1863 by Babu Navin Chandra Roy. It won quite a few adherents among the 'new Punjabis', the educated Hindu youngmen, who under the influence of Western education were averse to the dogmatic and superstition-ridden faith of their forbears. The Brahmo Samaj derived much for its basic tenets from the monistic philosophy of the Upanishads, but it also owed a good deal to inspiration from the ideals of Christianity. While it emancipated the souls of men from the bondage of superstition and blind faith in old customs the Brahmo Samaj failed to satisfy their patriotic longings for a national heritage because of its western orientation. Moreover, the Brahmo Samaj was torn by internal dissension.

At this time, in 1877, Swami Dayanand who had founded the Arya Samaj two years earlier, appeared in Lahore. Shortly afterwards the Arya Samaj was formally organized there. The Samaj too was mainly the 'outcome of the conditions imported into India by the West', but its main appeal was the call for return to the Vedic faith. The founder recalled the pristine purity and simplicity of the Vedic teachings and condemned unreservedly the corruption and decay which had crept into popular Hinduism. He opposed idolatory, elaborate rituals and priesthood and preached a monotheistic faith and simple worship. On the social plane, Dayanand denied the validity of the caste system based on birth and stood for social equality among all castes, including the depressed classes. He also preached against child marriages and advocated education of girls. Dayanand's message satisfied the cravings of the national spirit which in those days sought to realize itself in the field of social and religious reform. His reformed church was acceptable to the new generation of educated Punjab Hindus who wanted to discard polytheism and caste prejudices of their ancestral faith. It enabled them to adopt a new and a rational pattern of life without a break with their own culture and heritage.

The Arya Samaj found a large number of followers among the first generation of educated Hindus of the Punjab. Some of them who had originally joined the Brahmo Samaj transferred their allegiance to the new Vedic Church.

5. ENTRY INTO ARYA SAMAJ

When Lajpat Rai came to Lahore among his first mentors was Pandit Shiv Narain Agnihotri, at that time an earnest Brahmo leader of the Punjab,[3] and a friend of Munshi Radha Kishan. Pandit Agnihotri was an aggressive preacher, a gifted writer and a great orator Under his influence Lajpat Rai became a member of the Brahmo Samaj in 1881.

At the Government College among Lajpat Rai's contemporaries were two ardent young Arya Samajists, Pandit Guru Dutt Vidyarthi and Lala Hans Raj, who were to influence his life and ideas in a decisive manner. They soon became intimate friends. Speaking of the milieu of his College days Lajpat Rai recalled the

3. Later Agnihotri founded the 'Godless' church of Dev Samaj.

change that was coming in him due to his association with Guru Dutt and Hans Raj. He wrote, "In the beginning of that year [1882] my friendship with the late Pandit had developed into an intimacy. One result was that my outlook began to take on a nationalistic colour. The soul nurtured on Islam in infancy, and beginning adolescence by seeking shelter in the Brahmo Samaj began to develop a love for the ancient Hindu culture in the company of Guru Dutt and Hans Raj"[4]. The process of change was also helped by the study of Indian history which developed a sense of pride in the old heritage of Hindu India and deep sorrow over the degeneration of Hindus in the wake of alien invasions. Another factor that made a deep impression on Lajpat Rai and generated nationalistic feelings in him was the Hindi movement. Those days Lajpat Rai also studied some literature about the controversy that was raging among the three groups in the Brahmo Samaj. He was not yet eighteen and felt bewildered. He began to turn away from the Brahmo Samaj. On the other hand he began to appreciate the 'nationalistic outlook' of the Arya Samaj, but since his father. was hostile to Dayanand's teachings, Lajpat Rai hesitated to join it. However, he did not wait too long to make up his mind to be admitted into the Church which appealed to him.

It was in December 1882 that Lajpat Rai joined the Arya Samaj on the occasion of its anniversary celebrations. This was a turning point in his life and he always looked back on this event with pride and gratitude. Within an incredibly short time of his joining it Lajpat Rai became one of the front-rank leaders of the Samaj. His attachment to the Arya Samaj was not based primarily on its religious dogma. He was drawn to it by its nationalistic outlook, its social reform programme and its educational mission. The Samaj stimulated his patriotic impulses and the spirit of self-sacrifice, self-reliance and self-help. In fact it prepared him for the larger and more vital field of political work.

The two years Lajpat Rai spent at College proved to be eventful ones. These left a lasting impression on his character and determined largely the course of his public life. 'It was in those two years' wrote Lajpat Rai in 1914, 'I became wedded to the idea of Hindu nationality. It was in those two years I learnt to respect the

4. V. C. Joshi (Ed.) *Lajpat Rai—Autobiographical Writings*, p. 26.

ancient Aryan culture which became my guiding star for good. It was in those years that I fixed the mission of my life, not merely in theory but by practical work for it and that mission continues unchanged to this day'.[5]

6. AT HISSAR

Lajpat Rai's public career in the Samaj had a short break after he left Lahore because of the family's demands on him. He turned into its bread-winner at the early age of eighteen. On qualifying for Mukhtarship Lajpat Rai went to his native-town Jagraon for legal practice in the revenue court. Shortly afterwards in 1884 he shifted to Rohtak where his father was serving in the local school. Though his earnings as a Mukhtar were by no means poor—he earned about Rs. 200 per month—he felt toc much the humiliation of being a mere Mukhtar. At times he entertained a strong feeling to take up a teacher's job and serve the Samaj for all his life. The loyalty to the family, however, compelled him to reject the choice of such a life. In 1886, he passed the Pleader's examination and shifted to Hissar, a small district town in Southern Punjab, to practise as Vakil in the district courts.

For the next six years Hissar was the main centre of his activities and a training ground for his future public career. He proved to be a successful lawyer and soon came to occupy a position among the three top lawyers of the district. His income rose quickly and, according to him, it went up to Rs. 17,000 per annum ; it was never less than Rs. 10,000 a year. This was an indication of the opportunities the profession of law opened to the English educated class to improve their position.

At Hissar Lajpat Rai took keen interest in the Arya Samaj. During the last three years of his stay there he was an elected member of the Municipal Committee and also served as its honorary secretary. He was elected unopposed to the Committee from a ward which was mainly inhabited by Muslims.

At Hissar Lajpat Rai tried to fill in lacunae in his education by extensive reading, particularly in history and political literature. Here he also went through the first stages of his public life, but the

5. *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 28.

young pleader in spite of his success felt uneasy in the small town. Hissar was not the place for fulfilling his ambitions and he felt that he was 'neglecting his real mission and wasting his life.' Lajpat Rai longed for a wider field for his public activities. He, therefore, decided to leave Hissar. As soon as he was eligible for practising as Pleader of the Punjab Chief Court he applied for licence. In 1892, he moved to Lahore.

7. ENTRY INTO THE CONGRESS

When the first Congress met at Bombay in Christmas week of 1885 Lajpat Rai was a little known Mukhtar at Rohtak. The next year he had shifted to Hissar. His interest in political affairs began to increase with his success at the bar. By the time the Congress met for its third session at Madras in 1887, under the presidentship of Badruddin Tyabji, the popular appeal of the national organization had tremendously increased. The Congress pamphlets, mostly the work of A. O. Hume, the chief architect of the Congress movement at this time, had a wide circulation and were translated into vernacular languages. Two of these, 'A Congress Catechism' and 'A Conversation between Maulvi Furreduddin and Rambuksh of Kambakhtpur,' vividly depicted the evils of absentee landlordism and despotic government and pointed out that the only remedy for those evils was representative government for which the Congress was fighting. It appeared that a mass political agitation was in the offing.

At its birth, Lord Dufferin, the Viceroy, had blessed the Congress, but before the end of his regime he derided Congressmen as a microscopic minority and questioned their right to represent the people of India. The alien bureaucracy began to look with suspicion upon its activities. The Government put obstacles in the way of the fourth Congress to be held at Allahabad in December 1888. Auckland Colvin, the Lieutenant-Governor of North-Western Provinces, criticized the Congress and there was an open rift between the two. The Raj found a powerful ally in Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the respected leader of the Aligarh movement. He raised the standard of opposition to the national organization. Addressing his co-religionists in Lucknow on 28 December 1887 he challenged the very principle of representative government for India and exhorted them to keep aloof from the Congress. For him representative rule meant

majority rule, and therefore Hindu rule because of the numerical superiority of the Hindu community. He advised Indian Muslims to align themselves with the Government for securing their interest In August 1888, he set up the United Patriotic Association which served as the chief instrument of his anti-Congress activities.

In the Punjab the Congress movement was making some headway and the Indian Association was showing some signs of life. The Madras session was attended by nine Punjab delegates out of the 42 who had been elected. After this meeting the province was visited by Ali Muhammad Bhimji of Bombay on a lecture tour. He addressed a meeting at Hissar at the invitation of Lajpat Rai who had been very much impressed by the Madras Congress and Hume's pamphlets—"Old Man's Hope' and 'Star in the East'. Lajpat Rai first came to the notice of the authorities in this year for his active part in pressing the claims of Indians to higher appointments in the public service.[6] His debut, however, in the political field was significantly marked by his 'Open Letters' to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan which were published shortly before the Allahabad Congress in the Urdu Weekly, *Kohi-i-Noor* of Lahore. He was a great admirer of Sir Syed and to him the savant from Aligarh was a prophet of broadmindedness. Lajpat Rai was shocked at the too blatant a *volte face* of Sir Syed, particularly at his declaration that the interests of Hindus and Muslims clashed. In these letters Lajpat Rai showed how Syed Ahmed had gone back upon all that he had preached in his former days, quoting copiously from his earlier writings. The writer of the 'Open Letters' maintained that the Congress wanted to promote the same ideas which Sir Syed had advocated before the Congress was founded. He castigated the old man for the change in his views and challenged him to explain the reasons for it.

The 'Open Letters' created quite a stir in political circles. These received high praise from the senior Congress leaders and Hume published the English version of the letters in a pamphlet. When Lajpat Rai arrived at Allahabad to attend the fourth Congress, with the Punjab contingent of 80 delegates, he received a warm welcome. He was also accorded the honour of supporting the first resolution on the expansion of the Governor-General's Council and

6. NAI, Home Public (confd.) Deposit Procdgs., June 1905, no 37; Memorandum on Lajpat Rai. Also see *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 44. f. n.

of the Provincial Legislative Councils. In his maiden speech at the Congress he quoted usefully from the opinions of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in support of the resolution.[7] The delegates lustily cheered his performance. The young pleader, from a backward district of the Punjab, who was not yet twenty-four had found a place among the senior leaders of the Indian National Congress. The Congress was still an exclusive organization of the elite, the new educated and professional classes, and prayers, petitions and protests were its instruments for the political reconstruction of India.

The fifth Congress which met in December 1889 had, by a coincidence, record attendance of 1889, of whom 62 came from the Punjab, including Lajpat Rai. Sir William Wedderburn, a former Civilian like Hume, was the President of the session which was marked by the presence of Charles Bradlaugh, an eminent champion of the Indian cause in the British Parliament. In this session too Lajpat Rai was afforded an opportunity of supporting the resolution on Council reform and larger representation for Indians on the legislatures. A significant feature of the discussion on the subject was the claim voiced by a Muslim delegate for equal representation of his community for elected seats in the Councils. Lala Lajpat Rai pleaded that no distinction should be made among the members of the different communities in regard to political privileges. As for himself he emphatically declared, 'I am a Hindu, in the Punjab the Hindus are in a minority, and so far I am concerned I should be quite content to be represented by any good Mahomedan or Sikh member.'[8] He, however, supported the clause in the reform scheme embodied in the resolution providing for representation of minorities by men of their own communities to remove their fears and guard their interests.[9]

8. INDIFFERENCE TO THE CONGRESS

After the Bombay Congress Lajpat Rai's interest in the national organization waned. During the next fourteen years he virtually did not take active part in the Congress work except for his attendance at

7. *Report of the Fourth Indian National Congress held at Allahabad,* 1888, pp. 92-93.
8. *Report of the Fifth Indian National Congress held at Bombay, 1889,* p. 19.
9. *Ibid.*

its annual meetings at Lahore in 1893 and 1900. Though he met Hume and Bradlaugh in 1889, the Bombay Congress left an unfavourable impression on his mind. He felt, but vaguely, that the 'Congress leaders care more for fame and pomp than for the interests of the country.'[10]

The main reason for this indifference towards the Congress after 1889 was the influence of his Arya Samaj friends, in particular Rai Mul Raj, a staunch opponent of the Congress. They believed that the Congress having been founded by an Englishman and being an anglicised body it could not be expected to work for India's freedom. He believed along with them that the Congress had been founded as an innocuous organization in order to divert the attention of the Indian people from organizing a militant movement. Writing in *Young India* in 1916 he emphasized the 'safety valve' function of the Congress during its infancy.[11] Rai Mul Raj considered "the Congress not merely useless but detrimental to the interest of India."[12]

The second reason for the opposition of these Arya Samaj leaders to the Congress was that they had no faith in Hindu-Muslim unity and they believed that attempts at such unity would prove harmful to Hindus. Men like Mul Raj and Sain Das wanted first to work for Hindu solidarity. Their nationalism was basically 'Hindu nationalism' and they wanted to imbibe a spirit of unity among Hindus as they suffered from internal division.[13] The Arya Samajist leaders also felt that participation in political movement would make the bureaucracy suspicious about Hindus and the British government would obstruct their progress and harm them in other ways.[14] The Samaj, in its early days with its nationalistic outlook and principles of self-reliance and self-help of its members, was looked upon with suspicion by the Raj. The Samaj had several government servants among its members and therefore many of its leaders were in favour of eschewing politics.

Lajpat Rai did not necessarily share all these feelings but during this period his first loyalty was to the Arya Samaj. He too was

10. *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 86.
11. Lajpat Rai, *Young India*, (London, 1917), pp. 70-75.
12. *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 87.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 88.

devoted to the idea of Hindu nationality and cast his lot with the Samaj for the regeneration of the 'Hindu nation'. The Samaj left a permanent stamp on his thinking and his methods of work.

A cogent reason for Lajpat Rai's indifference to the Congress was his dislike for the holiday aspect of its annual meetings which he called "the annual national festival of educated Indians"[15] and absence of serious efforts at constructive activity. This feeling was born out of his austere Arya Samajic background. He had no love for what he called 'holiday patriots'. The Congress was confined to the Western educated professional class whose inspiring motive was the participation in the powers and privileges of the alien rulers It was a movement "of reform not of liberty" and the ardent Punjabi patriot did not expect much good to come out of its activities; it could not touch the basic questions of the ignorance and poverty of the Indian masses.

9. SPLIT IN THE ARYA SAMAJ

Lahore where Lajpat Rai came to live in 1892 was to remain the main centre of his public activities for the rest of his life. His work at the Chief Court bar, which demanded great perseverance at the initial stage, was rewarding. He was soon counted among the leading lawyers of the province. His income rose steadily ; but there was hardly any change in personal life of Lajpat Rai. He had learnt to live frugally and large savings were devoted to philanthropic objects. His abiding interest during the last decade of the century was the Arya Samaj. When he returned to Lahore the Samaj was heading towards a split. There was a clash of both principles and personalities and it appeared almost impossible to put an end to internal strife. Lajpat Rai tried first to be neutral and bring about a reconciliation between the two groups. His sympathies, however, were with the section led by Lala Hans Raj, Principal of the D.A.V. College, which was named in derision the 'Cultured party' and later came to be known as the 'College party'. The other group known as the 'Mahatmas', later called the 'Gurukula party', was headed by Lala Munshi Ram. The members of the latter group attached great importance to theology, Sanskrit studies, and vegetarianism. They

15. "The Coming Indian National Congress—Some Suggestions", *Kayastha Samachar*, November 1901

also considered infallible the teachings of Swami Dayanand. Lajpat Rai disliked religious dogmas and theological hair-splitting and was not a devotee type. He was also strongly in favour of English education, though he was not opposed to the inclusion of Sanskrit in the scheme of school and college studies. He wanted the Dayanand College to continue without a drastic change in its curricula. Along with the progressive section of the Samajists, who were rationalistic in their outlook and in favour of maintaining intellectual freedom, Lajpat Rai did not accept Dayanand and the *Satyarth Prakash* as infallible. On the question of diet he was indifferent ; he did not think it a sin to take meat diet. The Mahatmas, appeared to Lajpat Rai, to be too dogmatic, impractical and other-worldly. Lajpat Rai naturally cast his lot with Hans Raj and his associates. The squabbles between the two groups took an ugly turn and there was much mutual recrimination and unseemly personal attacks. The nerve-racking strife caused deep pain to Lajpat Rai and he felt ashamed of the unseemly behaviour of protagonists of both the sections. The split finally came in 1893. Those who supported the College resolved in September to withdraw from the established Arya Samaj and to hold their separate weekly prayer meetings. Lajpat Rai was elected President of the new Samaj.

Lajpat Rai was intimately connected with the Dayanand College from its inception. Since 1891 he was the Corresponding Secretary of the College Managing Committee. He was elected its Secretary on his arrival at Lahore and began to take active interest in the management of the College. To defend the College from the attacks of its opponents he started the *Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College Samachar*, a monthly paper, and also wrote in 1894 a booklet in Urdu giving an historical account of Sanskrit education in the College. He contributed frequently to the *Bharat Sudhar* and the *Arya Messenger*, the two papers of the College section, published in Urdu and English respectively. In addition to these activities he had to make frequent visits to the mofussil for raising funds for the College and for Arya Samaj propaganda.

Lajpat Rai was sincerely devoted to the College and was deeply interested in educational problems. For some time he also taught history to the College classes. In 1902 he tendered evidence before Curzon's Universities Commission. His memorandum covered both the administrative and academic aspects of the Punjab University.

He gave valuable suggestions for improving the teaching of physical sciences, history, political economy, English and Sanskrit. He wanted the University's Senate and Syndicate to be fully representative of teachers and educationists and opposed the appointment of government officials on these bodies.[16]

10. FAMINE RELIEF AND INDUSTRIAL CAMPAIGN

A memorable part of Lajpat Rai's activities relates to his pioneering effort in the field of famine relief. In this, as in many other spheres of public activity, he showed in practical way what self-reliance and self-help could achieve. In 1896-97 the Central Provinces were in the grip of a severe famine. Lajpat Rai was deeply moved by the reports that a large number of Hindu orphans and waifs were passing into the hands of Christian missionaries. The proselytising activities of the missionaries caused much concern. There was no Hindu agency for the protection of the destitute children. He, therefore, started, in February 1897, the Hindu Orphan Relief Movement for the relief of orphans of the Central Provinces. The movement was begun under the auspices of the Arya Samaj but it soon won the hearty co-operation of the entire Hindu community irrespective of caste and creed. The emissaries of Lajpat Rai succeeded in rescuing about 250 destitute children from Jabalpur, Bilaspur and other districts. They were brought to the Punjab and lodged in the Arya Samaj orphanage at Ferozpur and the newly established Hindu orphanages at Lahore and Amritsar This was the first time that philanthropists among the Hindu community made an attempt at organized charity.

The failure of the monsoon in 1898 and 1899 again caused widespread scarcity. The famine of 1899-1900 was much worse than that of 1896-97 and it affected large areas in the Punjab, Rajputana, Kathiawar and the Central Provinces. Heart-rending accounts of the sufferings of the famine stricken people were received at Lahore. Lajpat Rai again undertook the noble work of providing relief to suffering orphans and other destitute children. In an appeal to the public he said that a nation which could not protect its own orphans and waifs could not claim to 'command respect at the hands of other

16. Lajpat Rai's Memorandum, *The Tribune*, 1 and 3 May 1902.

people.'[17] The Hindu Orphan Relief Movement was resuscitated, with the members of the Arya Samaj taking a leading part. By the end of the year 1900 more than 2,000 orphans were rescued and brought into well-organized orphanages, providing food, clothing and educational training. The most striking feature of the organization was the plan for industrial projects to find remunerative employment for the orphans as well as for helping the industrial development of the Punjab. Though the movement had the co-operation of a large number of devoted workers, the main credit for its organization went to Lajpat Rai. In his case the impelling motives were humanitarian as well as service to Hinduism. His movement caused some friction with the Christian missionaries. Lajpat Rai's main contention was that Christian missionaries should not claim any Hindu orphans unless the Hindu agencies declined to take them. He put forward this claim before the Indian Famine Commission of 1901 on behalf of his movement. The Commission accepted his views and recommended in its report that deserted children and orphans 'should not be made over to persons or institutions of different religions until all efforts to find persons and institutions, of their own religion willing to take charge of them have failed.'[18]

Lajpat Rai's constructive genius was also applied in the economic field with some fruitful results. His interest in business perhaps came from the caste to which he belonged. As a devoted member of the Arya Samaj he was a votary of Swadeshi long before it became a popular slogan and a political weapon. The economic emancipation of India was dear to his heart, and for this he considered self-reliance and self-help as essential as for political freedom. In the correspondence columns of *The Tribune* one comes across ample evidence of his interest in improving the material resources of India. In 1891 he assiduously discussed the economics of the export of bones and their use as manure for increasing agricultural production.[19] He was unhappy about the gradual decline of the Indian trading class, like the artisans, in view of the business going into the hands of Europeans. He wanted Indian businessmen to take up export of wheat to Europe which was in the hands of foreign business

17. *The Tribune*, 24 October 1899.

18. *Report of the Indian Famine Commission, 1901*, (Calcutta, 1908), para 234, p. 77.

19. See *The Tribune*, 5 and 19 February 1891.

houses.[20] For obtaining maximum advantage of modern science and technology for development of Indian industry he emphasized again and again the urgent need for technical education of the right type. He was an ardent advocate of joint stock companies for finding adequate capital for industrial development of the country.[21] He wanted Indians to take to modern banking and was one of the promoters of the Punjab National Bank, which was founded in 1895.

11. BIOGRAPHICAL WRITINGS

Lajpat Rai's fame as a writer rests to an appreciable extent on the biographical literature he produced in Urdu. In 1896 he published short biographies of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Shivaji and two years later were issued those of Swami Dayanand and Shri Krishna. Mazzini was considered by Lajpat Rai as his political guru and he had been much impressed by the Italian movement of unification. The first three books were written by Lala Lajpat Rai with the purpose of infusing patriotic sentiment in the youth of the Punjab. The biographies were very popular and Lajpat Rai's Mazzini helped much in creating a new awakening, culminating in the events of 1906-07. The Government did not look with favour on this activity of the Punjabi nationalist. Legal pundits discussed the question of prosecution of the author. The Punjab Government, in forwarding English translations of *Mazzini*, *Garibaldi* and *Shivaji* to the Government of India, pointed out that in writing those books Lajpat Rai's 'motive was purely political, the object being to propagate sedition' They added, 'the author specially in the lives of Mazzini and Shivaji dwells largely on the evils of a foreign yoke and the desirability of attaining national freedom at any sacrifice.'[22] What saved Lajpat Rai from prosecution was the difference of opinion among the legal advisers of the Raj.

12. POLITICAL WORK

Despite his pre-occupation with the work of the Arya Samaj and the D. A. V. College, Lajpat Rai did not completely eschew

20. *The Tribune*, 13 May 1891.

21. "The Economic and Industrial Campaign," *Kayastha Samachar*, August 1901. Also see *Lajpat Rai in his Own Word*, pp. 39-44.

22. NAI, Home Public (conf.) Deposit Procdgs., June 1905, No. 37; Memorandum on Lajpat Rai.

politics. He participated in the occasional activities of the Lahore Indian Association and addressed meetings held under its auspices. He joined the Reception Committee of the ninth Congress held at Lahore in 1893 but he was not a very active participant. This session was attended by B. G. Tilak, and Lajpat Rai met him there for the first time. The acquaintance between the two leaders ripened into a deep friendship. In 1897 when Tilak was arrested on a charge of sedition Lajpat Rai led the campaign in Lahore for raising funds for the defence of the eminent nationalist from Poona.[23] The politics of Tilak were in line with the ideology of the Punjabi leader and they were to join hands shortly afterwards in infusing militancy into Indian freedom struggle.

The Punjab Arya Samajists evinced great interest in the 1900 Congress at Lahore. Lajpat Rai attended this session and pressed the Congress to devote greater attention to constructive work. He moved the resolution (No. XII) for setting apart half a day at each Congress for the discussion of educational and industrial problems. The resolution on technical education (No. VIII) also received his vigorous support. Lajpat Rai was elected to the Industrial as well as Educational Committees appointed by the Congress and he also became a member of the Indian Congress Committee for 1901.

At the turn of the century Lajpat Rai was prepared for active participation in politics. The programme of the Indian National Congress however was still not in line with his ideas about political work. He found it still involved in theoretical discussions and unwilling to adopt bold and constructive policies. On the eve of the Calcutta Congress of 1901 he called upon the national organization to shed off its festive character and undertake serious business instead of utterances of 'plausibly worded platitudes and well-disguised common places'[24]. Shortly after the Calcutta Congress, which was not different from the earlier meetings, Lajpat Rai again gave expression to his ideas about political work. He declared that the basic problem of India could not be solved by speeches or resolutions

23. Home Public (Confd.) Deposit Procdgs., June 1905, no. 37. Memorandum on Lajpat Rai.

24. 'The Coming Indian National Congress—Some Suggestions', *Kayastha Samachar*, November 1901, pp. 376-85. Also in *Lajpat Rai, The Man in his Own Word*, pp. 252-66.

only. What was needed was preparedness to undergo sacrifices for the cause of the country. He strongly disapproved begging for rigsth and insisted that rights should be claimed.[25] In other words Lajpat Rai wanted militancy to be injected into the political programme. For another two years he stayed away from the Congress.

By 1904 political climate had changed considerably. Lajpat Rai and his Arya Samajist friends were keen to revive political activity in the Punjab and renew contacts with the Congress. A newspaper in English was considered essential to serve as the organ of their party and therefore *The Panjabee* was launched in October 1904. Though Lala Lajpat Rai did not formally own or edit the paper its policy was controlled by him. He contributed regularly to its columns and often wrote its editorials also. The paper gave expression to the views of Lajpat Rai on politics, education, social reform and technical and industrial development.

Along with the launching of *The Panjabee* another momentous decision was taken. Lajpat Rai and his friends decided to renew contact with the Congress. He led a group of twenty-eight delegates to the Bombay Congress in 1904. The Congress had not yet lost faith in the expedient of securing political rights and privileges by appealing to the consicence of the British rulers. In view of the impending General Election in Britain, it decided to send a delegation to place before the British electors and political leaders the claims of India. The resolution was moved by the ardent nationalist of Maharashtra, Bal Gangadhar Tilak. Gopal Krishna Gokhale and Lajpat Rai were selected for this onerous task.

13. DELEGATE TO ENGLAND

The year 1905 was to prove a turning point in the political career of the young Punjabi leader as also in the history of the nationalist movement. Lajpat Rai eagerly seized the opportunity of a visit to England as a Congress delegate; but even before his departure from Lahore he categorically stated that he did not believe in the benevolent intentions of the British electors."[26] He added

25. 'The First Principles of Political Progress'. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, pp. 26-29.

26. *Writings and Speeches* Vol. I, p. 63.

that it was of no use to appeal to the British electors in the name of political philanthropy or ethical justice in matters political. Lajpat Rai could see the realities of the situation and was not over optimistic about the results of his mission. However, Lajpat Rai left Lahore on 10 May 1905 on his first trip abroad. When he arrived in London in June, he found that the Liberal party was not interested in advancing the cause of Indian freedom and the British electors were generally ignorant and apathetic as to the question of Indian reforms. Their minds were too much occupied with their own problems to give any attention to the affairs of a distant part of the Empire. The only section of Parliament Members from whom he received some sympathy and encouragement were the Labour and the Irish parties. He was convinced that they were the only people from whom Indian nationalists could hope to receive support.[27] Shortly after his arrival in London Lajpat Rai met the Indian revolutionary, Shyamji Krishna Varma and went to live at his 'India House'. Lajpat Rai found his political ideas similar to his own but disapproved Varma's bitter feelings against the Congress leaders.[28] Through Varma, Lajpat Rai came to know Henry Mayers Hyndman, the founder of the first socialist party of Britain, the Social Democratic Federation. The later socialistic ideas of the Punjabi leader can be traced back to his early contacts with Hyndman and other socialists of Britain.

Lajpat Rai returned to India fully convinced that India's political salvation would depend on the efforts of her own people. It was futile to depend on the benevolence of the English rulers or Parliament for the redress of Indian grievances. He wrote, "You can at times successfully appeal to the humanity and benevolence of individuals but to hope for justice and benevolence from a nation is hoping against hope. The rule of a foreign democracy is, in this respect, the most dangerous."[29] Lajpat Rai questioned the very basis of constitutional agitation in England and began to lay greater emphasis on self-reliance and self-help with regard to political work.

27. Gokhale Papers, letter No. 296.4, Lajpat Rai to Ganga Prasad Varma, London, 3 August 1905.

28. *Autobiograpical Writings*, p. 105.

29. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 113.

14. MODERATES VERSUS EXTREMISTS

Curzon had departed from India when the Congress delegates returned home but the last days of his regime were marked by a new ferment created by oppressive and despotic policies of that apostle of efficiency and his utterances casting slur on the character and ability of Indians. The partition of Bengal, announced on 1 September 1905, despite vehement protests, created a stir throughout the country. In 1905 India was pulsating with new life—the 'New Spirit' was in the air. In Bengal a movement of passive resistance, seeking mass support, was successfully launched. Congress leaders so far known for their moderation and their belief in strictly constitutional agitation were swept into it.

The New Spirit was also accompanied by the emergence of a new leadership, particularly in Bengal and Maharashtra. The new leaders, called 'Nationalists' or 'Extremists', were impatient with the 'mendicant' expedients of the Congress and wanted to infuse militancy into its programme. They had no faith in resolutions, prayers and petitions for liberating the country from alien rule. The Partition proved a blessing in disguise for the Extremists who were led by ardent patriots like B. G. Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal and Arabinda Ghosh. Lajpat Rai too shared their sentiments and political ideology. He too accepted Swaraj, Swadeshi and Boycott as the new religion of India. During his stay in London he had witnessed some mass demonstrations and Lajpat Rai advocated the use of such instruments to create an effect on the Raj. He wanted a change in the nature of the Congress programme to make it acceptable to the people and to secure their support for the national movement. In a letter to Babu Ganga Prasad Varma of Lucknow, Lajpat Rai wrote, 'Unless you are prepared to change the nature of your [Congress] movement in this direction you are not likely to make any progress towards political freedom at all and I am sure that if the Congress will not take the initiative in this matter some other movement may have to be set up to do the same and then the Congress will dwindle into insignificance."[30]

The polarization in the view-points of the new and old leadership in the Congress, the Extremists and the Moderates, took place

30. Gokhale Papers, Letter No. 296.4 Lajpat Rai to Ganga Prasad Varma, London, 3 August 1905.

by the time the Congress met at Banaras in December 1905 under the presidentship of Gokhale. The first clash occurred in the Subjects Committee when the resolution of welcome to the Prince of Wales was moved. Lajpat Rai and Tilak strongly opposed the resolution, but the Moderates' viewpoint prevailed and the resolution was adopted by a majority of votes. The Nationalists led by Lajpat Rai and the Bengal and Maharashtra leaders were determined to offer opposition in the open session; but in deference to Gokhale's earnest wishes they allowed the resolution to be passed by absenting themselves from the plenary meeting when it was moved there. The Congress was thus saved from an unseemly open conflict.

Lajpat Rai addressed the Banaras Congress on the last day of its session when supporting the resolution of protest against the Government's repressive policy in Bengal. The speech was an exquisite piece of impassioned eloquence which stirred the feelings of his audience. Lajpat Rai justified resort to passive resistance in the political movement and congratulated Bengal for heralding a new political era for the country. He exhorted them not to behave as beggars any longer and show manliness in their struggle for emancipation from foreign yoke. Lajpat Rai also stressed the urgent need for 'a band of earnest missionaries to work out the political regeneration of the country', and said that it was a matter of shame that Congress during its twenty-one years life had not produced any 'political Sanyasis' prepared to sacrifice their lives for the regeneration of India.[31] The speech created a stir in the Congress camp. The old leaders did not relish its tone ; but it made a visible impact on the audience.

A few days before the Banaras Congress, addressing a mammoth gathering on the occasion of the Lahore Arya Samaj anniversary, Lajpat Rai had said that he 'saw blood raining from the national sky, the sky looked clear, but specks of blood were already visible '[32] This proved to be a correct prognosis by a careful political observer of the situation in the country. The policy of repression was launched in Bengal by the bureaucracy with unprecedented serverity. In April 1906 the Conference at Barsial was forcibly broken up by the authorities, nationalist leaders were arrested and virtually a reign of terror prevailed in East Bengal. Lajpat Rai welcomed the unrest in Bengal and the mass appeal of the new movement, a movement of

31. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 101.
32. *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 109.

self-help and self-reliance.

His political creed was the same as that of the Extremists, but he did not look with favour on their extravagant attacks on the old leadership. He felt that if the old leaders failed to change with the times 'their leadership itself would be in danger.[33] Lajpat Rai deplored the unpleasant controversy in Bengal on the issue of the presidentship of the forthcoming session of the Congress at Calcutta. He blamed the Extremists for their rigid attitude in the matter and also the old leaders for their unreasonable suspicions about Tilak, whom the new leaders wanted to elect.[34] Lajpat Rai welcomed the election of Dadabhai Naoroji as the President of the session since it could stop the quarrel about the presidentship.[35] The thought of a schism in the Congress was distressing to him as he had already experienced the bitterness caused by the split in the Arya Samaj. Lajpat Rai, moreover, held in high esteem both Tilak and Gokhale. He took pride in enjoying the goodwill and friendship of the leaders of the two opposing groups. His efforts therefore were directed towards the maintenance of unity in the national camp. At the Calcutta Congress (1906) the differences between the Extremists and the Moderates came to the surface and a fierce controversy raged. Lajpat Rai exercised a moderating influence and it was at least partly due to his efforts that the Congress was saved from an open rupture for another year. The Left and the Right in the Congress, however, had fallen apart and looked upon each other with suspicion.

15. DEPORTATION TO MANDALAY

The Punjab which had been absolutely quiet during Curzon's regime was in ferment during 1906-07; a 'new air' was blowing in men's minds. The unrest which first appeared towards the end of 1905 fast gathered momentum and assumed a menacing aspect bythe spring of1907. The new spirit affected all classes of people, including the rural population. Riots took place at Lahore and Rawalpindi. On the last day of April the Lieutenant-Governor, Denzil Ibbetson, regarded the political situation in the pr vince

33. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 129.
34. *Ibid.*,pp. 128, 131.
35. Gokhale Papers, Letter No. 396.15, Lajpat Rai to Gokhale, Lahore, 4 October 1906.

'as exceedingly serious and exceedingly dangerous.'[36]

The Punjab unrest was not the product of outside influences or just some thing whipped up by the Extremist agitators. There were a number of causes which fed the fire of mounting discontent. The situation was correctly diagnosed by Lajpat Rai and succinctly summed up in a communication to *The Panjabee*, written by him only a few hours before his arrest.[37] The unrest, according to him, was due to several causes arising out of unjust administrative and legislative measures of the Local Government. Significant among those were the Colonization Bill, increase of irrigation rates in the Bari Doab Canal and the abnormal increase of land revenue in Rawalpindi district.

The Government failed to appreciate the underlying causes of the discontent and insisted on passing and enforcing unpopular measures in the teeth of opposition from the people. The agents of the Raj could not gauge the depth of the feelings of the people because of the wide gulf which separated them. With the rising unrest in the spring of 1907 the bureaucracy was taken by panic ; as the year marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Sepoys' uprising at Meerut, they had terrible apprehensions of evil days. They blamed the politicians for the serious unrest quite oblivious of the genuine grievances of the people. In this tense situation the Punjab Government wanted to make an impressive show of force and struck at Lajpat Rai, the most popular leader in the province, a man whose character was above all reproach. Though some Extremists agitators, among them the fire-brand Ajit Singh, took advantage of the resentment among the peasantry to arouse their feelings against the Government, Lajpat Rai's aims and methods had been strictly constitutional. He was arrested on 9 May 1907, a day before the fiftieth anniversary of the Meerut outbreak, and was quietly deported to distant Mandalay. Ajit Singh followed him there a few days later. Both of them were deported under Regulation III of 1818, which precluded any opportunity to the condemned for legal defence. Lajpat Rai as well as his countrymen were kept in the dark as to the reasons which prompted the Government to take this extraordinary measure.

36. *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 229. Ibbetson's minute.

37. *The Panjabee*, 11 May 1907. See *Autobiographical Writings*, Appendix I, pp. 223-227.

The deportation caused great indignation among the nationalists throughout the country. The Extremists as well as the Moderates joined in the protest against the deportation without affording Lajpat Rai a chance to defend himself. Tilak took a challenging posture and wrote in the *Kesri*, 'If the rulers adopt this Russian method then the subjects in India will have to imitate the subjects in Russia.'[38] Such sentiments were echoed in other organs of the Nationalist press. Gokhale, the Moderate, castigated the Government for its high-handed action in deporting his Punjabi friend. He significantly exclaimed, "We certainly do not want disorders in the land, but the reforms which the Viceroy and the Secretary of State are contemplating will lose their meaning for us, if they cannot be had without the deportation out of India of such earnest and high-minded workers in the country's cause as Lala Lajpat Rai."[39] As Gokhale put it the Government 'struck at Lala Lajpat Rai because he was the most prominent worker in the Province."[40] Henry Nevinson, the noted English journalist, who was in India in 1907-08, writes of his meeting with a British officer at Peshawar. When Nevinson asked the latter why a man of Lajpat Rai's character was selected for the Government's attack, the reply was 'You see, it was just because he was so good that they fired him. If he had been a rotter, they would have left him alone.'[41] The Anglo-Indian press made wild charges against him and called him a revolutionary and arch-seditionist. His countrymen however believed in his innocence.

Though Minto had agreed to the deportation of Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh in May 1907, he soon recognized the real cause of the unrest and vetoed the Punjab Colonization Bill, despite the strong views of the Local Government to the contrary. It was realized that the discontent in the Punjab was essentially agrarian in character and the removal of the main grievance of the agriculturists was responsible for restoration of peaceful conditions in the province. The Viceroy also felt that the orders of deportation were hasty and unjust. He wrote to the Secretary of State, 'Lajpat Rai is undoubtedly

38. *The Kesri*, 21 May 1907, quoted in Stanley A. Wolpert, *Tilak and Gokhale* (Berkeley, 1962) p. 204.

39. Gokhale's letter of 22 May 1907, published in *The Tribune* of 25 May 1907.

40. *Ibid.*

41 H. W Nevinson, *The New Spirit in India* (London, 1908) p. 303.

a man of high character and very much respected by his fellow-countrymen, and if when I was asked to arrest him, I had known what I do now, I would have required much more evidence before agreeing.'[42] Morley, already harassed by repeated questions in the House of Commons regarding the act of deportation, was obviously relieved to see this change in the Viceroy's opinion. In his private correspondence he had been urging Minto for the release of Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh. They were restored to freedom six months after their arrest. Lajpat Rai returned to Lahore on 18 November.

16. THE SPLIT AT SURAT

The deportation gave Lajpat Rai the halo of martyrdom and he returned from Mandalay a great national hero. He was at the height of his popularity and his name was put forward by the Nationalists, led by Tilak, for the presidentship of the year's Congress at Surat. The proposal caused a consternation in the Moderate cirlces [43]. The Moderates, like Gokhale, had great personal regard for Lajpat Rai, but they could not take the risk of having a man of his political views as the President, particularly so shortly after his deportation. Acceptance of the ex-deportee would virtually mean throwing a challenge to the bureaucracy; it would also amount to surrender to the Extremists. The Moderate group that controlled the Congress and the Reception Committee at Surat had decided on the election of one of their own kind, Rash Behari Ghosh. Lajpat Rai would have willingly accepted the presidentship if offered unanimously but he was unwilling to take sides in the conflict between the two groups and in a public statement made it clear that he would be the 'last person to allow himself to be made the reason or the occasion, of any split in the National camp.'[44] He also declined to support the proposal for holding of a separate Nationalist Congress at Nagpur.[45] He assured Gokhale that the latter's action regarding the presidentship had his full support, and added, 'I am prepared to heartily

42. NAI, Minto Papers Microfilm, Minto to Morley, 5 November 1907.

43 Surendranath Banerjea wrote to Gokhale to request Lajpat Rai to publicly dissociate himself from the movement. Gokhale Papers, Banerjea to Gokhale ; Calcutta, 12 December 1907.

44. The *Tribune* 17 December 1907, Lajpat Rai's letter to the Editor.

45. Gokhale Papers, Letter No. 296 22.

co-operate with you in your noble efforts, to preserve harmony in the national ranks, but I am afraid my voice is not likely to prove more effectual than yours. However, I shall do my best and I hope that our joint efforts might at any rate reduce the number of irreconcilables.'[46] There was apparently no change in the ideological stand of Lajpat Rai since his restoration to freedom, but he insisted on unity within the Congress ranks. As a man with a pragmatic approach to Indian politics he wanted the two groups to work within one national organization. Lajpat Rai's sense of gratitude to Gokhale for his efforts to secure his release was very strong and at this time the Punjabi leader could not be expected to oppose him in politics.

At Surat Lajpat Rai played the role of a peace-maker between the two parties. He tried hard to bring about a compromise to enable the Nationalists to participate in the Congress. When the split came he, not caring for popularity, decided to remain with the Moderates and declared that he would continue to fight under the flag of the old Congress. He joined the Moderate Convention and served on the Convention Committee which was given the task of drafting the new Congress constitution.

Following the split Lajpat Rai did not adopt a partisan attitude. He availed of the first opportunity of making an earnest appeal to the Moderates as well as Extremists to work in harmony for the national cause and not to play into the hands of the common enemy. Speaking from the presidential chair of the Swadeshi Conference at Surat, he appealed to the Moderates not to give by their actions the Extremists over to the enemy and expose them to persecution by the Government. He entreated his Extremist friends 'not to be impatient on the slowness of age and the voice of practical wisdom.'[47]

Though Lajpat Rai attended the Allahabad meeting of the Convention Committee in April 1908 and signed the new 'Creed' of the Congress, he soon drifted away from it. He did not find his political ideas in harmony with the Congress programme. His Nationalist friends had been completely alienated from it because of the uncompromising attitude of the Congress high command. Without its left wing the Congress had virtually become an ally of the Government.

46. *Ibid.*
47. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 148.

The policies of the Moderates had unwittingly exposed the Extremists to repression and its politics had become lifeless. The extinction of the extreme left wing, Lajpat Rai felt, was a 'menace' to the Congress itself. He soon questioned the representative character of the national body under the exclusive control and management of the Moderates.[48]

Lajpat Rai had another grievance against the Congress leaders who had extended their support to the principle of separate denominational representation to the minority community embodied in the Reform scheme.[49] He was opposed to separate communal electorates and also felt, along with many Hindu leaders of the Punjab, that the Congress had acted against Hindu interests, particularly in the case of his own province where the Hindus were in a minority. For these reasons Lajpat Rai's interest in the Congress waned and he did not attend its annual meetings until 1912.

17. FAMINE RELIEF AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

Freedom from obligations of an active political life helped Lajpat Rai to devote his energies to educational, social and humanitarian causes. During the months following the fateful Surat Congress he worked with dedication for the relief of famine-stricken people of the United Provinces. In the famines of 1896-97 and 1899-1900 his activities had been largely devoted to the work for relief of Hindu orphans. In 1908 their scope was widened to include general relief irrespective of the community or creed of the sufferers. The relief work was well-organized and met with remarkable success. He had to travel widely to collect funds and supervise the work of famine volunteers. The Government however did not look upon his philanthropic work without suspicion. He as well as his famine relief emissaries were kept under strict surveillance and doubts were entertained in Government circles regarding the use of famine relief funds for political purposes.[50]

48. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 182.

49. *Ibid.*

50. NAI, Home Political, Deposit Proceedings, November 1908, No. 7. This record contains a detailed account of Lajpat Rai's activities in 1908 as viewed by the Government agents. Also see Gokhale Papers, Letters Nos. 296.29 and 296.31, Lajpat Rai to Gokhale, 20 March and 28 May 1908.

These suspicions were without foundation as the volunteers had strict instructions not to carry on any religious or political propaganda. Lajpat Rai suspected, and not without justification, that the authorities disapproved all types of philanthropic and national work which was likely to bring popularity to the leaders.[51] Suffering from constant worry because of close espionage and distressed at the demoralization in political life of Lahore since his deportation, Lajpat Rai decided to leave India for England.[52] He sailed from Bombay on 29 August and did not return until March next year.

On his return from England in March 1909 Lajpat Rai resumed practice at the bar which he had given up since his deportation. He, however, did not actively participate in political work for some time. His energies were mainly devoted to the promotion of education and social reform. Apart from his interest in the Dayanand College, for which he raised enormous funds, he started the Hindu Elementary Education League to help in the education of Hindu children. During this period he took active interest in the elevation and education of the depressed classes ; his object being to raise them both socially and intellectually. This work was taken up by Lajpat Rai not in a spirit of charity, but as a moral duty towards the suppressed people. In 1911 Lajpat Rai made his second venture into the field of municipal administration with his election to the Lahore Municipal Committee. The authorities were still suspicious of his motives ; but he discharged his duties as a Municipal Commissioner with unusual zeal.

Lajpat Rai re-entered the Congress in 1912 at its annual session at Bankipore, Patna. His unforgettable performance at this session was the fervent advocacy of the cause of Indians in South Africa in an eloquent speech in Hindustani. At the next Congress at Karachi, held in December 1913, he again spoke on this subject. During those days he also led a campaign in the Punjab for raising funds for the Indian sufferers in South Africa.

51. Gokhale Papers, Letter No 296.32, Lajpat Rai to Gokhale, 9 July 1908.

52. Gokhale Papers, Letter No. 296.33, Lajpat Rai to Gokhale, 20 August 1908. Also see Home Political Deposit Proceedings, November 1908, No. 7. Memo on doings of Lajpat Rai since his release.

18. AS CONGRESS DELEGATE IN ENGLAND

The Karachi Congress decided to send a delegation to England to represent the views of the Congress on the reform of the India Council, for which a Bill was being introduced by the Secretary of State in Parliament, and other matters in which the Congress had shown interest. Lajpat Rai joined the delegation as representative of the Punjab. He reached London in May 1914.

During his absence from India five out of the nine Provincial Congress Committees voted him for the presidentship of the Madras Congress. Though the final choice lay with the Reception Committee there was every chance of his election. When informed of this significant development by a friend in India, he decided without hesitation to decline the high office, even if offered to him. He felt that he would not be happy among the Madras politicians and the Moderate leaders with whom he had fundamental ideological differences. He pointed out emphatically that his political creed was substantially the same as before his deportation. By accepting the presidentship, he felt, that he would put himself in a 'wrong hole.'[53] Before his wishes, however, were known in India some of the prominent Congress leaders, scared at the prospects of Lajpat Rai's election as President, set on foot a move to make a second reference to the Provincial Committees with the ostensible motive of reversing their decision. They feared that his election would not be expedient in view of Lajpat Rai being *persona non grata* with the Government and the Muhammadans. Two of the Provincial Committees changed their decision under pressure and the Reception Committee elected Bhupendranath Basu as President of the Madras Congress.

The War broke out when Lajpat Rai was about to leave England for a trip to the continent. He had to abandon his plans and bide his days in London until the situation cleared up. Though he signed a pledge of loyalty to the Empire along with the other members of the Congress delegation—Bhupendranath Basu, M. A. Jinnah and N. M. Samarth—Lajpat Rai did not believe in unconditional support to Britain in the War. He belonged to the school of Indian politicians who wanted to extend help to Britain on a clear understanding as to India's future position in the Empire. In

53. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 216.

London, during his enforced stay, he engaged himself in study and writing for the press. Several of his contributions found their way into the columns of Liberal and Labour papers.

When Lajpat Rai left in April 1914 he did not expect to be away from India for more than six months ; but the War compcompletely upset his plans. To return to India appeared to be hazardous because of the political persecutions launched by the Government. A political realist, as he was, he made up his mind to stay away from India.

19. AN 'EXILE' IN U. S. A.

After he had finished his book on the Arya Samaj, Lajpat Rai decided to leave for the United States in the company of his friend Babu Shiv Prasad Gupta of Banaras. He sailed from England on 14 November 1914 and arrived in New York a week later. Lajpat Rai had visited America in 1905 for a brief period of three weeks. during the second visit he did not contemplate a stay for more than a few months. But circumstances forced him to extend his sojourn there to the end of 1919. In 1915 he paid a five months' visit to Japan.

In the United States, Lajpat Rai usefully employed his time in study, writing and propaganda on behalf of India. He virtually assumed the role of Indian nationalist ambassador to the United States whose main function was to inform enlightened Americans about the conditions in India. His propaganda met with encouraging response, especially among the liberals, radicals, socialists and pacifists of the United States. He was able to create a favourable atmosphere for India's cause and succeeded in getting a hearing in the American press and on American platform. In order to provide Americans with a correct account of conditions in India and enlighten them about political problems facing the country, Lalaji had called into service his vigorous pen. He wrote during this period several books and pamphlets on different aspects of the Indian problem The first of these, *Young India, An Interpretation and History of the Nationalist Movement from Within*, published in August 1916, created great interest in America and Britain. It was the first attempt by an Indian political leader to write an interpretative work on the subject of Indian nationalism. The book constituted the most damning

indictment of the British rule in India ; but it also delineated in bold relief an important phase in the political thinking of Lajpat Rai.

The publication of *Young India* was followed, a year later, by *England's Debt to India*, the economic counterpart of the former work which depicted a painful picture of economic exploitation of the country under British rule. In 1919, was published the *Political Future of India* which contains Lajpat Rai's views on the Montford reform scheme and related problems. In a different class stands his *Problem of National Education for India* (London, 1920), also written during his American period. This work, the product of serious study and observation for many years, offers a clear analysis of his philosophy of education.

Another of his notable achievements in the United States was the establishment, in October 1917, of the Indian Home Rule League of America with the laudable object of supporting the home rule movement in India. The League with its headquarters in New York provided his propaganda an institutional form and made it possible for Americans sympathetic to the Indian cause to work in collaboration with Indian nationalists. A monthly organ of the League, also named *Young India*, was started in January 1918 with Lajpat Rai as Editor. A year later he set up the Indian Information Bureau in New York to serve as a publicity organization on behalf of India. Lajpat Rai attached great value to organized propaganda abroad to win sympathy and support for India ; but he did not believe at any time that his country's salvation would come from outside. He was categorically opposed to reliance being placed on foreign help for winning freedom.

During his stay in the United States and Japan, Lajpat Rai came into contact, at times against his own wishes, with a group of Indian revolutionaries who aimed at fomenting revolution in India with the aid of German arms and funds. Their operations were directed by the German authorities who wanted to exploit political unrest in India for bolstering their own imperialistic designs. The Indian revolutionaries made repeated overtures to Lajpat Rai to obtain his support in their cause. It appears that the German Government was keen to enlist Lajpat Rai on its side. Lalaji turned down their offers unhesitatingly and refused to associate himself with their plans. His attitude was stated in his letter published in *New York Times* of 9 March 1917 after Chandra Kant Chakravarty, the

leading Indian agent of Germany on the East coast of America, was arrested in connection with what is known as the 'Hindu-German plot'. He wrote, 'I am a Hindu nationalist working for the attainment of self-government for India but I do not believe that it would be worth our while to achieve that end by foreign military aid. I am sure that the vast bulk of my fellow nationalists in India and elsewhere are of the same mind. What we want is self-government and not a change of masters'.[54] Lajpat Rai did not have any faith in the *bona fides* of the British promises but at the same time he did not believe that alliance with Germany would do any good to the Indian cause.

Lajpat Rai had disapproved consistently the methods and activities of revolutionary groups in India, but he admired their courage and spirit of patriotism. His experience of the Indian revolutionaries in U. S. A. and Japan was however 'very sad and disappointing'. He found many of them 'absolutely unprincipled both in the conduct of their campaign and in the obtaining and spending of funds'.[55] Generous supply of German money had corrupted and demoralized them. The result was that Lajpat Rai lost all faith in secret organization and 'forcible revolution'. Terrorism, in his judgement, was 'not only futile but sinful.'[56]

His stay in New York proved valuable to Lajpat Rai in providing opportunities of coming into close contact with several American intellectuals and enlightened men and women in different walks of life. He also met there some of the eminent men from Europe who came on short or long visits to the United States. Exchange of ideas with those men widened his horizon and gave him an international outlook. Though Lajpat Rai was fifty when he went to America, he was receptive to new ideas and was keen to observe all aspects of life in foreign lands, which could be of any value to India. His association with socialists, particularly after the October Revolution, helped to develop his interest in socialism and labour problems. Under these influences his personality and his ideas went through significant changes which are clearly reflected in his writings. He

54. Quoted in Home Political Deposit Proceedings, July 1919, No 55; History Sheet of Lajpat Rai.

55. *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 288.

56. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 327

was in 1919 preaching the 'gospel of social democracy'[57] and economic and social justice to all classes of the Indian people. His ideas on education and social reform underwent a transformation under the impact of his American experience.[58]

Prolonged exile weighed heavily on Lajpat Rai. He felt lonesome and wanted to return home at the earliest available opportunity. He was not prepared for the role of a permanent exile and therefore had followed the path of moderation in his propaganda. Lajpat Rai, however, knew that it was not safe to go back to India during the War; he did not want to be a 'martyr' by an act of indiscretion. The signing of the armistice brought hope to him. In January 1919 he applied for a passport to travel to England, France and India, but to his disappointment the request was turned down by the British authorities. The efforts to obtain the necessary facilities for travel continued on his part but the unhelpful attitude of the British Government almost drove him to despair. It appeared that his exile would not end for an indefinite period. While in New York he received the shocking news of the massacre at Amritsar. He was deeply distressed by the ghastly Jallianwala Bagh tragedy and longed to be with his people in the hour of their agony and suffering. The feelings of loneliness and depression aggravated; but he continued with his propaganda. The British authorities finally relented and gave him a passport to travel to India. He sailed from New York on 24 December 1919 for London. During his short stay in England he met several of his socialist friends, including H.M. Hyndman, Ramsay Macdonald, George Lansbury and Josiah Wedgwood. He also had a brief meeting with George Bernard Shaw. On his way back home Lajpat Rai also visited Paris and Lausanne and finally reached Bombay on 20 February 1920. A warm and affectionate welcome awaited him when he landed on Indian soil after an absence of nearly six years. The reception was led by Lokmanya Tilak, M. A. Jinnah and Mrs. Annie Besant. A hero's welcome was given to him when he reached Lahore five days later.

57. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 313.

58. See his articles on 'National Education' and 'Social Reconstruction in India', *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. I, pp. 349-89.

20. INDIA OF 1920

"It is an entirely new India to which I have come back ; it is an awakened, self-conscious and defiant India." Thus wrote Lajpat Rai to his friend Josiah Wedgwood shortly after his return to India.[59] India of 1920 was no doubt radically different from India which Lajpat Rai left behind in 1914. The War shattered the myth of British superiority and gave to Indians a new feeling of self-confidence and dignity. The country underwent a mental revolution as a result of the War which, though fought far away from its borders, affected deeply its economic life and its politics. The Russian Revolution and President Wilson's declarations on War aims of the Allies helped in a large measure to foster the urge for self-government. Indians now demanded self-government as their fundamental right on the basis of the principle of self-determination, so loudly acclaimed by the Allied leaders. The Moderates' policy of seeking concessions from the British Government stood discredited and the old leadership of the Congress lost ground. By 1918, Lokmanya Tilak and politicians of his school of thought were in full control of it. The Congress was no longer a close preserve of the English educated class as it was in 1914. Freed from cautious leadership it was fast turning to mass support. 'Moderatism' of Mehta and Gokhale was virtually extinct as a political force in India of 1919.

The British Government too could discern the change in the political climate and was willing to make fresh political concessions. In the Declaration of August 20, 1917, it set forth 'progressive realization of responsible government in India' as the aim of the British policy. This momentous Declaration was followed, a year later, by the reform scheme embodied in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. There was a feeling of hope in the country. It appeared that the Government had abandoned its policy of repression and reaction in favour of one of conciliation and progress.

The hopes of the people soon proved illusory. Whereas they expected a generous gesture from the Government for all that India had suffered for the Empire during the War, its end was marked by

59. Lajpat Rai's letter to Wedgwood quoted in C. V. Wedgwood, *The Last of the Radicals—Josiah Wedgwood* (London, 1951) p. 142.

the initiation of a new policy of repression. The Rowlatt Bills, the 'Black Bills' as they were popularly called, introduced in the Imperial Legislative Council early in 1919, caused widespread disappointment and indignation in the country. Despite the unanimous opposition of the non-official Indian members, one of the Bills was placed on the Statute-book, on 21 March, as the Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act, 1919. The 'Black Act' armed the Executive in times of peace with arbitrary authority of suppressing the whole political life in the country and of depriving citizens of the right to an open trial, to the assistance of a lawyer, and to the safeguards provided under the Evidence Act and other laws of the land.

The agitation against the Rowlatt Bills brought to the forefront a new leader in the person of Mahatma Gandhi who a year earlier was earnestly occupied in finding recruits for the defence of the Empire. His protests to the authorities were of no avail and he decided to start *Satyagraha* movement which caught the imagination of the people. At the end of the War the feelings of Indian Muslims were also greatly agitated at the dismemberment of Turkey and the future of the Khilafat. They regarded the treatment accorded to Turkey as a betrayal on the part of Britain and the Allied powers and a wave of indignation swept through the community. The Muslim agitation on the Khilafat question was soon allied to the anti-Rowlatt Bills movement led by Gandhi. The two communities came together by a sense of common danger and Hindus and Muslims fraternized on a scale never witnessed before in India. The movement of *Satyagraha*, launched with protest meetings and hartals by Mahatma Gandhi, won unparalelled support of the Indian masses, Hindus and Muslims alike. On 13 April, General Dyer enacted with unprecedented cruelty the ghastly massacre of Jallianwala Bagh. This act of unrestrained brutality at Amritsar and the horrors of the martial law regime in the Punjab roused the country to a bitter determination to fight the alien rule. In the wake of these events the offer of constitutional reforms sounded hollow. A new phase in Indian history began with the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. The country was 'tense with emotion' at the end of 1919, but the Congress still did not want to widen the breach. At its Amritsar session in December, it decided, under the influence of Gandhi, to work the Reforms though declaring the Reform Act as

'inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing.'

Lajpat Rai returned to India at this stage, a crucial stage indeed in the history of the Indian nationalist movement. With a prophetic prescience he had forecast in 1916 a 'more bitter and more sustained' struggle in India after the War. He found himself in the midst of one as soon as he set foot on Indian soil. To him the most hopeful signs of the situation were the political awakening of the masses and the newly born sentiment of unity among Hindus and Muslims. Though he was not satisfied with the Reform Act he was "in favour of working the Reforms in a genuine spirit of co-operation," provided that was made possible by the Government.[60] He was, however, suspicious about the intentions of the bureaucracy in their attempt at excluding Nationalists from any participation in the framing of the Rules under the Act.

The chances of reconciliation and a peaceful settlement became bleak by the spring of 1920. The Hunter Committee report, issued on 26 May, and the action taken by the Government of India and the Secretary of State thereon shattered whatever faith was left in Indian minds in British justice. The Committee was divided on racial lines and the Government endorsed the views of the European majority. The sympathy that Dyer aroused among Anglo-Indians and the British public and the resolution of the House of Lords in his support further embittered feelings in India. The Treaty of Sevres on Turkey's future set ablaze the smouldering fire of discontent among Indian Muslims. Lajpat Rai could measure the depth of the feelings of his countrymen and visualize the possibilities of unwelcome political disturbances. His reaction to the situation was expressed in the letter he wrote to Wedgwood. He said, 'I sincerely believe that we cannot afford to have chaos and disorder in our country at this stage of our evolution. There are elements in India who may rise equal to the occasion if any disorder does appear but still I would prefer ordered progress with the certainty of our getting complete responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Commonwealth in the near future than run the risk of being thrown into a whirlpool of opposing and contending

60. *The Tribune*, 28 February 1920; Interview with the reporter of *The Tribune*.

forces."[61]

21. NON-CO-OPERATION MOVEMENT

Lajpat Rai was elected in July 1920 to preside over the special session of the Indian National Congress scheduled to meet at Calcutta in early September. The session had been called to devise measures for the redress of the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs and to decide on the Congress attitude towards the Reforms. Before the Special Congress met, and even before Gandhi announced his programme of Non-co-peration, Lajpat Rai repudiated the Reforms and proposed the boycott of the new Councils. For himself he declared in unequivocal terms that he would not stand for election. The acceptance of the majority report of the Hunter Committee by the Government of India and the Secretary of State, was regarded by Lajpat Rai as 'the virtual denial of the Principles on which the Reforms Scheme is based.' The continuation of the officers who were responsible for committing atrocities in the Punjab also confirmed his belief that no change in the old regime was contemplated.[62] At the Special Congress Lajpat Rai, however, maintained neutrality as President. Gandhi's resolution on Non-violent Non-co-operation was adopted by a majority of votes in spite of the opposition offered by some of the veterans in the Congress. Lajpat Rai was in favour of Council boycott but he was sceptical about the advisability as well as practicability of other items in the programme of Non-co-operation—the boycott of law courts, educational institutions and foreign goods. He was particularly opposed to withdrawal of students from educational institutions.

By the time the Congress met at Nagpur at the end of the year, Lajpat Rai's views on Non-co-operation had changed considerably and he fell in line with Gandhi on this vital question. He extended his support to the Non-co-operation resolution which was accepted with virtual unanimity at Nagpur.

The response of the country to the call for Non-violent Non-co-operation was magnificent. The people were intoxicated with their new dreams of achieving independence in twelve months, as

61. Letter to Josiah Wedgwood quoted in *The Last of the Radicals*, p. 142.

62. *The Tribune*, 3 July 1920, Lajpat Rai's letter to the Editor.

contemplated at Nagpur, and their newly acquired unity and strength. Lajpat Rai having accepted the programme of Non-co-operation entered the struggle with exuberant fervour. As President of the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee he directed the movement in the Punjab and also undertook an all-India tour in furtherance of the programme of Non-co-operation. The Government was rather bewildered at the growing strength of the new movement. It was hesitant to take strong action against non-violent non-co-operators, but was on the alert for the first signs of violence or mass outbreak. The bureaucracy launched a policy of unmitigated repression all over the country following the successful hartal and rioting in Bombay on the arrival of the Prince of Wales on 17 November. The Congress and Khilafat volunteer organizations were declared illegal. There was an orgy of arrests in December 1921 and eminent leaders of the movement, including Motilal Nehru, C. R. Das and Lajpat Rai were clamped behind the prison doors. Lajpat Rai was arrested on 3 December and sentenced to 18 months imprisonment under the Seditious Meetings Act. He did not offer any defence, following the mandate in regard to the boycott of law-courts, but soon the legal pandits of the Government gave their opinion against the conviction. He was released on 31 January 1922, but was re-arrested as soon as he stepped out of the prison gates on a different charge and sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment.

22. WITHDRAWAL OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

The Congress replied to the Government's repressive measures with a resolution, passed at Ahmedabad in December 1921, 'to organize individual civil disobedience and mass civil disobedience.' On the failure of mediation efforts of Pandit Malaviya and others Gandhi, now the undisputed leader of the movement, decided to launch mass civil disobedience in Bardoli taluk of Gujarat. The impending struggle created a great stir in the country and the attention of all the people was focussed on Bardoli. When all was set for a heroic struggle Gandhi decided to suspend the movement on hearing of the violent action of the mob at Chauri Chaura, in Gorakhpur district, on 5 February. The Congress Working Committee met at Bardoli on 11-12 February under the shadow of this tragedy and on the initiative of Gandhi decided to withdraw the movement.

The decision about Bardoli, in the words of Lajpat Rai 'burst upon a confiding, expectant and hopeful country like a bomshell. The shock was too sudden, cataclysmatic and unexpected. It bewildered and to a certain extent surprized and angered the people.'[63] The sudden retreat looked like a betrayal. None could understand why Gandhi chose to stop the entire movement for the mistakes of a mob in an isolated village on the northern borders of U.P. The leaders in prison were indignant and sent their angry protests from behind the bars. Lajpat Rai conveyed his strong reactions in a frank and outspoken letter to the Congress Working Committee.[64] He criticized the Mahatma for pitching his standard of non-violence too high for the possibility of achievement. Lajpat Rai's adherence to the movement of Non-co-operation was not actuated by any ideological belief in non-violence. He accepted it as the only suitable expedient to fight the foreign rule, but unlike Gandhiji, he did not entertain any religious convictions about it. In prison Lajpat Rai pondered deeply over the first principles and basic ideals of Non-co-operation and formulated his views in a series of articles which had a wide circulation in Indian papers.[65]

23. THE SWARAJIST PHASE

In March 1922 Gandhi was arrested and sentenced to six years' imprisonment on a charge of sedition. The Non-co-operation movement collapsed soon afterwards. When Lajpat Rai was released in August 1923 a parliamentary wing had already emerged within the Congress, under the leadership of C. R. Das and Motilal Nehru. Towards the end of 1922 Lajpat Rai extended his support to the Swarajist group by advocating a change in the Congress programme. In a letter to C. R. Das, written from Lahore Jail on the eve of the Gaya Congress, he advised rethinking about the Congress programme and adoption of changes according to the prevailing situation. He wrote, 'Politics is a changing game and I do not believe in any inflexible, cut and dried scheme good for all times and under all circumstances.'[66] On return to freedom Lajpat

63. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 137.

64. Ibid. pp. 88-96.

65. These were reprinted in *Ideals of Non-co-operation and other Essays*, Madras, 1924.

66. *The People*, 13 April 1929, p. 61.

Rai commended the Swarajist programme, but at the same time he was keen about maintaining unity in the Congress ranks which appeared to be at stake on account of sharp differences between the No-changers and those who advocated entry into legislatures. As ill-health was to keep him away from the Special Congress at Delhi, in September, he made an earnest appeal to the delegates not to allow the Congress to be dismembered, reminding them of the unpleasant developments subsequent to the split at Surat. He recommended that those who were in favour of Council entry should be allowed the 'liberty of conscience and action.'[67] The Delhi Congress resolved to concede such freedom to those who were in favour of parliamentary activity and suspended all propaganda against entering the Councils.

The elections in the Punjab in 1923 were virtually run by Lajpat Rai for the Swarajists, but he could not stand for election because of the disqualification on account of his two years' sentence. He was, however, elected to the Central Legislative Assembly in December 1925. After taking the oath of Membership in the following January he joined the Swaraj Party. Lajpat Rai proved to be a source of strength to the Opposition with the resources of his wide learning, thorough knowledge of social and economic problems and his impassioned eloquence. Towards the end of 1925 the Swaraj Party was rocked by dissension with the emergence of the 'Responsivist' group under the leadership of M. R. Jayakar, N. C. Kelkar and B. S. Moonje. Lajpat Rai was personally opposed to 'uniform, continuous and consistent obstruction' and a policy of indiscriminate walk-outs from the legislatures. He had some sympathy with those who advocated responsive co-operation though he did not entirely agree with their views, particularly about acceptance of Offices. At the same time he did not want a split in the Swaraj Party and made every attempt to bring about reconciliation between the two groups. At the Kanpur session, when the Congress accepted the Swarajist programme, Lajpat Rai remained with the official Congress, in preference to joining the Responsivist group. In March 1926 he opposed vehemently Pandit Malaviya's move for organizing a united Nationalist Party with a programme of responsive co-operation with the Government.

67. *The Tribune*, 12 September 1923; statement of 10 September.

24. THE HINDU-MUSLIM PROBLEM

The period following the collapse of Gandhi's Non-co-operation movement was marked by accentuation of communal differences and the edifice of Hindu-Muslim unity so assiduously built up by Gandhi suddenly came to pieces. The communal problem was to engage Lajpat Rai's serious attention for the rest of his political career. He had started his public life as a Hindu Nationalist under the influence of Arya Samaj, but even then he believed that Hindus and Muslims could join hands in their struggle for independence against the alien rulers. He also came to accept the concept of a composite Indian nationality. Writing in his book on the Arya Samaj in 1914 he said, 'The Arya Samaj has to remember that India of today is not exclusively Hindu. Its prosperity and future depends on the reconciliation of Hinduism with that greater ism, the Indian Nationalism—which alone can secure for India its rightful place in the comity of nations. Anything that may prevent, or even hinder, that consummation is a sin for which there can be no expiation.' He was rejoiced to witness the friendly feelings among the two communities on his return to India in 1920. The establishment of communal accord was essential, according to Lajpat Rai, for the success of the freedom movement. But even before he came out of jail Lajpat Rai became sceptical about the achievement of permanent union between Hindus and Muslims. The misgivings were caused by the discussions he had with several of the Khilafat leaders who were in prison with him and the study of Muslim law and Muslim history. His mind suffered from conflict and he wrote to C. R. Das, in December 1922, 'I do honestly and sincerely believe in the necessity and desirability of Hindu-Muslim unity ; I am also fully prepared to trust the Muslim leaders, but what about the injunctions of the Quran and Hadis? The leaders cannot override them. Are we then doomed ? I hope not. I hope your learned minds and wise heads will find some way out of this difficulty.'[68] Lajpat Rai's doubts were perhaps ill-founded as for as his study of the Muslim law and tradition went, but outside the prison walls the communal situation was not at all hopeful even for the most optimistic of his compatriots. The chances of a genuine Hindu-Muslim unity were receding very fast and the country

68. *The People*, 13 April 1929, p. 61.

witnessed an orgy of serious communal riots. With the decline in the strength of Non-co-operation movement communal strife increased and assumed menacing proportions.

Soon after Lajpat Rai was restored to freedom he devoted his attention to finding a solution of the communal question. He aimed at a lasting settlement of the differences between the two communities and his approach to this vexed problem was eminently practical and pragmatic. The problem, he felt, could not be solved by sentimental talk and 'temporary patchwork or symbolical treatment'. His cold analysis of the situation led him to the candid conclusion that the solution of the problem lay not in mixing or reconciliation of the communities but of their integration. He stated, 'what we aim at is not the merging or the absorption of the one into the other, but the integration of all into one whole, without in any way injuring or lessening each group individuality.'[69] He also realized the basic need for 'a definite and abiding understanding about the position which the communities have to occupy in the future Government of the country.'[70] With this object in view he drafted in collaboration with Dr.M.A. Ansari the 'Indian National Pact.' But, with the growing suspicion and feelings of hatred between the major communities, nothing came out of this laudable effort.

There was a crop of Hindu-Muslim riots in 1924, the most serious of which occurred at Kohat, in the North-West Frontier Province, on 9-10 September. In this two-day riot about 150 Hindus were killed or wounded and the entire community of four thousand had to be evacuated for safety to Rawalpindi, thus highlighting the crisis of confidence between the two communities. Mahatma Gandhi fasted, the Unity Conference met and a Central National Panchayat was set up ; but nothing was achieved to find a solution of the communal problem. Hindus began to lose faith in the achievement of Hindu-Muslim accord as a result of the riots. The Kohat tragedy caused grievous pain and disappointment to Lajpat Rai to whom Hindus of the North-West Frontier looked for help and succour in the moment of their misfortune. He attended the Unity Conference and served on the National Panchayat ; but he was perturbed over the indifference of the authorities as well as the

69. Lajpat Rai, *The Ideals of Non-co-operation*, p. 4
70. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 147.

leaders to the gravity of the issues raised by the Kohat incident. He stated categorically that there was little chance of unity being achieved unless the 'Kohat wounds' were healed.[71] The advice given by Gandhi to Kohat Hindus to repose complete trust in Muslims of the town after the riots, did not appear to him as sound and practicable. He also disagreed with the Mahatma's opinion that Kohat Hindus should have died defending their lives and temples and that they were guilty of cowardice in not doing so.'[72] After a careful study of the Hindu-Muslim problem, which he considered as 'the problem of India,' he contributed in November-December 1924 a series of thirteen thought provoking articles to the Indian press.[73] In these he discussed with rare objectivity the historical, religious, social, economic, political and psychological causes of the conflict between the two communities and made some valuable suggestions to solve the problem. Lajpat Rai, as an eminent leader of the Hindu community and with a long record of services to the country, was in the best position to speak on the subject with understanding and confidence. In those articles he did not absolve Hindus for their share in the growth of communalism in India, and he advised them to remove all social barriers which separate and antagonize communities. He called for purging politics of religion and rationalization of religion. He had a fundamental objection to separate electorates as these were based on the pernicious idea of antagonistic communal interests of the two communities. These articles proved to be very significant in the light of later developments in India. In 1924 there was no talk of Pakistan but Lajpat Rai's insight into the Indian situation almost suggested the possibility of Muslim demands being so augmented as to claim a division of India. He was keen to prevent such a development. Lajpat Rai could understand the implications of the British policy of making concessions in favour of Muslims in opposition to the growing Indian nationalism. He deprecated the policy of appeasement of the Muslim community and urged the Congress not to compete with the Government 'by pacts based on pernicious principles.'[74] He was also opposed to bringing about a

71. *The Tribune*, 19 November 1924.
72. *Ibid.*, 1 January 1925.
73. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. II, pp. 170-222.
74. *The Tribune*, 26 February 1925. Lajpat Rai's statement on 'Mahatma Gandhi and Hindu-Muslim Question.'

communal settlement by surrendering legitimate rights of the Hindu community. It may be relevant to note that Lajpat Rai belonged to the Punjab where Hindus were in a minority and could not afford to be as generous as Hindus of provinces where they commanded large majorities.

The communal riots generally resulted in a greater loss in lives and property to Hindus than to Muslims. Only a naive person could believe that the economic disparity between the two communities was the sole cause of this development ; it could not always be a case of poor Muslim robbing or killing his richer Hindu neighbour. The Hindu leaders were upset about it and they ascribed the suffering of the Hindus to their internal weakness. The solution offered was the strengthening of the community. A new phase started in the communal strife with the initiation of the Hindu movements of *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan*, as a counterblast to Muslim *Tabligh* and *Tanzim*. *Shuddhi* aimed at the reconversion of those who had left the Hindu fold and *Sangathan* constituted an attempt to consolidate and strengthen the Hindu community. Lajpat Rai lent his support to these movements. He was, however, more interested in the removal of untouchability and elevation of the depressed classes for which he set up a new organization, the All-India Achhut Uddhar Sabha. Unfortunately these attempts at uniting and solidifying Hindus provoked Muslim feelings and accentuated further communal antagonism. Lajpat Rai also joined the Hindu Mahasabha which attained great popularity with the rise of communal passions. He was, however, opposed to the Mahasabha adopting a political programme. In his address as President of the Mahasabha in 1925 he stated that 'the Hindus had no political aims of their own separate from those of their countrymen of other faiths,' and denounced the talk of Hindu Raj or Muslim Raj. In 1926 when the general elections were approaching he successfully opposed the idea of the Mahasabha running its own candidates for the legislatures. Reiterating the principle of divorcing religion from the domain of politics he declared, 'I am in favour of organizing the Hindu community, strengthening and solidifying it religiously, socially and economically, but I do not favour the idea of Hindus setting up a separate political existence of their own.'[75] He believed that Hinduism could not thrive

75. *The Tribune*, 2 March 1926 article on 'Hindu Mahasabha and Council Elections'

by perpetuating communal quarrels in a way incompatible with the growth of Indian nationalism.

Lajpat Rai gave no quarter to those who indulged in insults to religions. When the Arya Samajist publisher of *Rangila Rasul,* a scurrilous pamphlet on the Prophet of Islam, was acquitted by the Punjab High Court in 1927 he declared him to be morally guilty. He even went to the length of supporting the Government in amending the law to deal effectively with such offences even though it amounted to curtailment of civil liberties.[76]

Lajpat Rai's views on the Hindu-Muslim question raised a storm of controversy in political circles and his critics were a host. His *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* heresies incensed the Muslim leaders , they dubbed him a rank communalist in spite of their own support for *Tabligh* and *Tanzim.* Among many of the Hindu Congress leaders too there was a lack of sympathy for his approach to the problem which differed radically from the policy of the Congress.

25 LAJPAT RAI AND SOCIALISM

Lajpat Rai has been acclaimed by some as the first socialist of India. This claim would be untenable judged by the standards of orthodox Marxian socialists, but none can deny that he had a social and economic outlook which was rare among Indian leaders of his generation. His frequent visits abroad afforded him an opportunity of coming into contact with socialist leaders and he imbibed some of their ideas. The Social Democrat Henry Hyndman was the first among his socialist friends. Lajpat Rai met Hyndman in 1905. He could not meet Keir Hardie during the latter's visit to India in 1907 as he was then an exile in Burma. The two met in England in 1909 and soon became intimate friends. Lajpat Rai entertained feelings of devout admiration for the Scottish miner who had unswerving sympathy with India's aspirations. Ramsay Macdonald met Lajpat Rai during his Indian visit in 1910. Prominent among Lajpat Rai's other British socialist friends were Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Josiah Wedgwood and George Lansbury. In the United States Lalaji mixed freely with radicals and socialists in New York. He also read Marxist literature, particularly after the October Revolution.

76. *Writings and Speeches,* Vol II, pp. 360-63; speech in the Legislative Assembly on 5 September 1927.

As mentioned earlier, exchange of ideas with eminent socialists influenced deeply his views on social and economic matters and aroused his interest in labour and trade union movements. By the beginning of 1919, he had come to accept socialtstic ideas though he did not subscribe to the Marxist creed. To him the question of Indian freedom was not confined to removal of foreign dominance but also one of establishment of 'real democracy.' He did not want 'the mere substitution of the rule of property and privilege in place of the foreign Imperialists and Capitalists ;[77] he looked for the dawn of 'an era of equal opportunity and equal justice to all.'[78] Speaking about the solicitude of the authors of the Montford Report for the Indian ryots he wrote, 'We are a friend neither of the landlord nor of the capitalist. We believe that the ryot and the working men in India as elswhere are being exploited and robbed by the classes in possession of the means of production and distribution. We would whole-heartedly support any scheme which would open a way to a just and righteous distribution of wealth and land in India and which would ensure the ryot and the working man his rightful place in the body politic.'[79] Lajpat Rai was not hopeful that the ryots would be rehabilitated by the politically minded classes of India when they would come into power. But still he supported unhesitatingly the demand for self-government of the politically minded classes, as he considered that to be the only way for bringing about political consciousness among the ryots and working men. He wrote, 'Absolutism must first give way and transfer its power to the political minded classes, then will come the turn of the masses to demand their rights and compel compliance.'[80] He believed that the struggle for genuine democracy would commence only after the departure of the foreign exploiter. Until such time would come he advocated unity among the masses and the classes to win freedom from foreign domination. Lajpat Rai criticized the Montford scheme of reforms as he thought it added to the powers of the capitalists and landlords. The Government of India,' he said, 'as at present constituted is a Government of capitalists and landlords, of both England and India. Under the proposed scheme the power of the former will be reduced and that

77. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. 1, p. 313.
78. *Ibid.*, p. 314.
79. Lajpat Rai, *The Political Future of India* (New York, 1919)pp.53-54.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

of the latter increased.'[81] Despite his borrowing liberally from the Marxist jargon Lajpat Rai did not uphold a doctrinnaire approach to socialism and refused to accept the Marxian dialectics. He did not agree with Karl Marx that 'a country should go through the capitalistic mill, before the proletariat comes to its own.'[82] He did not favour the introduction in India of the European system with all its disastrous consequences of which he was well aware. He wanted to avoid, if possible, the evils of the class struggle.[83] His objective was to achieve a classless society without class war. This was to be accomplished through a process of evolution rather than by a violent change and splitting of the country on sectional lines. His was the creed of a 'humanitarian socialist' and not a scientific socialist in the Marxian tradition. Lajpat Rai was much attracted by the objects of the British Labour Party and advised his countrymen to adopt its aims as their own.[84] In 1924, he himself formally joined the Independent Labour Party in London.

On his return to India in 1920 Lajpat Rai wanted to put into practice his socialistic ideas ; but his involvement in the Non-co-operation movement and later his pre-occupation with the communal problem left him little time to organize a socialist party in India. He was, however, able to make a valuable contribution to the organization of the Indian labour movement. In December 1920 he presided over the first Indian Trade Union Congress which met at Bombay. Dwelling on the evils of unrestrained capitalism in his Presidential address he exclaimed, 'Militarism and Imperialism are twin children of Capitalism. They are one in three and three in one.'[85] In 1926 Lajpat Rai attended the International Labour Conference at Geneva as the representative of the Indian working class. In the Central Legislative Assembly he made an effort to organize a labour group to espouse the cause of the working classes. He advised nationalist leaders to help Indian labour 'to a position of safety and security' and not to show an attitude of partiality towards capitalists.[86] He however did not favour any solution of the labour problem which would be detrimental to the growth of Indian industries.

81 *Ibid.*, p. 202.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 202.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 204.
84 *Ibid.*, p 203
85. *Writings and Speeches*, Vo. II, p. 56
86. *Ibid.*, p. 238.

26. BREAK WITH THE SWARAJISTS

In the summer of 1926 Lajpat Rai attended the International Labour Conference and also visited Britain and France. He returned to India in the middle of August On August 24, he resigned from the Swaraj Party when the Legislative Assembly was in session at Simla. The reasons for this sudden change are not far to seek. Lajpat Rai was essentially an independent in politics and independents seldom make good party men. Often his 'prudence' led him to adopt contradictory lines of action. In 1907 he stayed with the Moderates, though he had to part company with them shortly thereafter. Before he was elected to the Central Legislative Assembly he had often criticized the Swaraj party and disapproved its policy of continuous obstruction. His views on the communal problem too were at variance with those of the Swarajist leaders. Even then he joined the Swaraj Party in January 1926 when he entered the Assembly. He had his sympathy for the Responsivists at the Kanpur Congress, but under pressure of friends he decided to support the Swarajists. The action of the Swaraj Party to stage walk-out in the Legislative Assembly on 8 March 1926, even before the vote on the budget was taken, was not to his liking but still Lajpat Rai strongly opposed Pandit Malaviya's move to set up a coalition of Nationalists with the object of responsive co-operation. In a speech delivered in Bradlaugh Hall, Lahore, on 27 March, he vigorously defended the policy and programme of the Swaraj Party. On his return to India he found the Swarajists still adamant about their 'walk-out' plan. Lajpat Rai insisted that the Swaraj Party should attend the monsoon session, particularly the debates on the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill and the communal resolution, but the Party would not agree to his proposal. Lajpat Rai could not bear the strain of Party discipline and took the decision to quit it. The resignation appeared as a *volte face* on the part of Lajpat Rai. The leader of Swarajists, Pandit Motilal Nehru, was indignant. An unbecoming controversy followed between the two leaders in which they forgot their usual restraint and dignity. To fight the coming elections Lajpat Rai organized the Independent Congress Party in collaboration with Pandit Malaviya. The new party was opposed to the 'walk-out' programme of the Swarajists and also the Congress policy on the communal question. It stood for communal amity but was not in favour of achieving that at the cost of legitimate Hindu rights. The

Independent Congress Party won an astounding success against the Congress in U. P. and the Punjab. Lajpat Rai himself was elected to the Central Assembly from two constituencies with comfortable majorities against the Congress candidates. In the new Assembly Lajpat Rai always extended his support to the popular causes. He collaborated with the Congress Party in opposition to the Government. Forgetting the bitter acrimony of the election days Motilal Nehru and Lajpat Rai re-established cordial relations to work for the national cause.

In May 1927 Lajpat Rai left for Europe mainly to recoup his shattered health. He was in London when Miss Katherine Mayo's muck-raking *Mother India* appeared. The book constituted a wholesale and indiscriminate vilification of Indian civilization and Indian character by a foreign journalist. Aptly called a 'drain inspector's report' by Gandhiji, *Mother India* created quite a stir in India as well as in Britain. Lajpat Rai was convinced that the publication was a part of the unscrupulous anti-Indian propaganda organized and financed by those who were opposed to India's claim for self-government at the 'psychological moment'. The American authoress was not a disinterested observer; she was anti-Asian in her sympathies and an imperialist interested in the maintenance of Anglo-Saxon supremacy in the world. Lajpat Rai would not allow to go unchallenged the abuses and calumnies indiscriminately heaped by her on the Indian people. On his return to India he made it his first duty to write a fitting reply to Miss Mayo's work and by January 1928 his *Unhappy India* was in the press. Though written in haste it was an able and dignified answer to Miss Mayo's infamous propaganda.

27. SIMON COMMISSION AND NEHRU REPORT

Political activity in India suffered a serious setback with the collapse of the Non-co-operation movement and the rising tide of communal passions. The continuing cleavage between the two major communities stood in the way of national unity; there were 13 Hindu-Muslim riots in 1927. But before the end of the year quiescent Indian politics was a thing of the past. A new life was infused into the struggle for independence. The main factor that brought about the sudden and unexpected revival in Indian politics was the decision of the authorities in Whitehall to appoint the Indian

Statutory Commission to enquire into the question of Indian reforms. The Commission's Chairman, Sir John Simon, and his six colleagues were all Members of the British Parliament. The total exclusion of Indians from a royal commission that was to report on the future constitution of India appeared to be a glaring case of racialism. It was a negation of India's right to have any voice in the determining of her future constitution. Despite British disclaimers, the composition of the Simon Commission was regarded by Indian public opinion as a calculated insult to the Indian people. The announcement of 8 November 1927 caused almost universal disappointment and indignation in India. Contrary to official reckoning all parties were unanimous in their protest and a powerful movement spread throughout the country to boycott the Commission and its enquiries. The movement was a great success. By the end of the year it received the support of the major political parties, the Indian National Congress, the National Liberal Federation and the All-India Hindu Mahasabha. In the Muslim League Jinnah joined the boycott, but Muhammad Shafi's group voted for co-operation.

The appointment of the all-white Commission did not come as a surprize to Lajpat Rai. During his visit to England in summer he had carefully observed the trends in the Indian policy of the Conservative Government and the Commission's composition was as anticipated by him. His mind was made up to boycott it. Immediately after its formal announcement he declared that he was 'not going to associate with the Commission in any shape or manner.'[87] He objected not merely to the exclusion of Indians but to the very policy which underlay the appointment of the Commission. He questioned the right of the British Parliament to settle the type of the constitution which India was to have. Therefore, Lajpat Rai was of the view that the boycott should be irrevocable and nothing should be said of the terms on which Indians could co-operate. Even the appointment of a few Indians on the Commission could not induce him to lend his support to it. Lajpat Rai felt that the Indian people should settle their own constitution and for this purpose he suggested the convening of a round table conference of 100 eminent Indians belonging to all parties and communities to take up the question of drafting a constitution of free India and the

87. *The People*, 17 November 1927.

immediate appointment of a Committee of 21 to prepare a skeleton draft and submit it to the conference.[88] He led a vigorous campaign against the Commission both in press and from platform. Those Hindu leaders of the Punjab who were inclined to offer co-operation received a stern warning from him. He told them that their pro-government attitude would not effect a change in the pro-Muslim policy of the Government which was based on imperial and international considerations.[89] On February 16, 1928 he moved in the Central Legislative Assembly his resolution refusing co-operation to the Commission 'at any stage or in any form'. His speeeh on the occasion[90] was a memorable performance for the manner in which India's case was presented. The resolution was adopted with the overwhelming support of the Indian elected members.

In the meantime the Indian National Congress at its annual session at Madras, in December 1927, had decided to convene an All-Parties Conference to draft a constitution for free India. The derisive outbursts of Birkenhead, challenging India's ability to frame her own constitution, helped in forging a united front. There was a generous response to the Congress proposal for the All-Parties Conference which met in Delhi in February under the chairmanship of M. A. Ansari, the Congress President. The Conference appointed a Committee, with Motilal Nehru as President, to draft the constitution of free India and to make a report on the communal problem. The Report of the Nehru Committee, embodying the results of the first serious attempt by Indians to frame their own constitution, was issued early in August and its detailed recommendations were accepted at the All-Parties Conference which met at Lucknow from 28 to 31 August. Lajpat Rai welcomed the Nehru Report and he moved the resolution in its appreciation at the Lucknow Conference. The goal of Dominion Status as outlined in the Report was acceptable to him without any hesitation. Lajpat Rai was not in favour of the idea of severance of the British connection, but at the same time he was not prepared to oppose the propaganda in favour of complete independence conducted by the younger Congressmen. For Lalaji the most welcome part of the Nehru Report was the provision for joint mixed electorates throughout India. It amply vindicated his stand against the pernicious principle of separate communal

88. *Ibid.* 89. *The People*, 11 November 1927,
90. *Writings and Speechs*, Vol II, pp. 378-98.

representation which had been accepted both in the Congress-League Scheme of 1916 and the Bengal Pact of 1923. He earnestly appealed to the people to judge the Report from a national point of view and not from a narrow communal angle. To Lajpat Rai the Committee's conception of the future Government of India, was the only one on which the building of a free India was possible. He declared, 'Those who will oppose it will practically oppose Swaraj and may be justly described as the enemies of India.'[91] He was particularly critical of the Punjab Hindu leaders who were against the acceptance of the Report and asked for separate electorates and reservation of seats for Hindus in the provincial Legislature. He warned them against the risk of losing the sympathy and support of the rest of Hindu India in their attempt to win the favours of the Government. From August onwards Lajpat Rai was mainly occupied in mobilizing public opinion, particularly Hindu opinion, in favour of the Nehru Report and the movement for boycott of Simon Commission.

28. LAST DAYS AND DEATH

Lajpat Rai's was not a career of unqualified success. At times he doubted whether there had been any success at all. He had his moments of frustration and pessimism, which made him doubt even his fitness for participation in public life. According to a devoted friend, Lalaji was suffering towards the end of his life from a feeling that his friends had left him and he was extremely unhappy.[92] He felt miserable and even began to lose faith in God. This mood of frustration, religious scepticism and despondency is reflected in his letter of 12 July 1928 to G. D. Birla.[93] The only safe refuge open to him in such a state of mind was action. As before, in the last year of his life he sought action, nay he sought the storms, to get over his despondency. Despite his old age and ill-health he was prepared to take all risks and was in the forefront of the Simon Commission boycott movement. He presided over the Agra Provincial Hindu Conference held at Etawah on 27-28 October and was back in Lahore on 30 October, the day Simon Commission was to arrive at Lahore. Lajpat Rai led boldly a mass demonstration

91. *The Tribune*, 23 August 1928.
92. Diwan Chand, *Mansik Chitravali* (Kanpur, 1960) p. 101.
93. *Writings and Speeches*, Vol. II, pp-417-22.

against the Commission in front of the Lahore railway station and was brutally assaulted by the police with regulation lathis. The demonstration was, from all accounts, peaceful and the police attack was unprovoked and wanton. It appeared to have been deliberately aimed at Lalaji. The physical injuries were not very serious but the proud leader felt deeply the humiliation of the assault. At a public meeting, held the some evening at Lahore, he spoke with bitterness about the unwarranted and merciless action of the police officials. After narrating the circumstances of the brutal attack he warned the Government about the possible consequences of its policy of repression. He said, 'I want to say from this platform that every blow that was hurled at us this afternoon, was a nail in the coffin of the British Empire. No body who has seen that sight is likely to forget it. It has sunk deep into our soul. We have to avenge ourselves of this cowardly attack, not by violently attacking them but by gaining our freedom. I wish to warn the Government that if a violent revolution takes place in this country, the responsibility for bringing it about will fall on such officers as misbehaved themselves this afternoon. Our creed still stands and we are pledged to a struggle of peaceful non-violence. But if the Government officers continue to behave like this I would not wonder if the young men were to go out of our hands and do whatever they chose with the object of gaining the freedom of their country. I do not know whether I shall be alive to see that day. But whether alive or dead, if that day is forced on them by the Government, my spirit from behind will bless them for their struggle.'[94]

These words of impassioned eloquence produced a thrilling effect on his big audience and millions of his countrymen who read the speech the next day in the newspapers. The country was indignant at the calculated affront to a popular national leader.

Lajpat Rai did not survive the assault very long. Within a week of the incident he went to Delhi to attend the All-India Congress Committee and the All-Parties Conference, but returned to Lahore before his scheduled programme because of ill-health. To M. R Jayakar he told in Delhi, 'I feel weak, but apart from the wound, I feel that I am not the same man as before. I feel that it

94. *The Tribune*, 2 November 1928.

is a most disgusting humiliation when so attacked.' The shame and pain of the humiliation had sunk deep into his heart and he was never seen happy after the incident. To quote Jawaharlal Nehru, Lalaji 'felt angry and bitter, not so much at the personal humiliation, as at the national humiliation involved in the assault on him.'[95] He died on the morning of 17 November of heart failure. What effect the assault had on his death is very difficult to say. The doctors were of the opinion that the police attack accelerated his death. The mental shock he sustained possibly hastened his end. The general impression in the country however was that the injuries had caused the death of the leader and that the police had deliberately murdered Lajpat Rai.

The assault on Lajpat Rai and his death ended whatever little chance there was of withdrawing the boycott. The movement was intensified and on the failure of attempts to reach an understanding with the Government, the Congress launched, early in 1930, civil disobedience movement. As forecast by Lajpat Rai in his speech of 30 October, a violent revolutionary movement also sprang in the Punjab, following his tragic death, a movement aimed to avenge the cowardly attack on him. Saunders, an Assistant Superintendent of Police, who was alleged to have shared in the assault, met a violent death at the hands of a young revolutionary, Bhagat Singh, who was to pay for the crime with his own life. Bhagat Singh became a popular hero in India. His popularity, as pointed out by Nehru, was not due to his act of terrorism, 'but because he seemed to vindicate for the moment, the honour of Lala Lajpat Rai, and through him of the nation.'[96]

Lajpat Rai's death brought to a close a long career of distinguished public service. Among the numerous tributes paid by leaders from India and abroad the most touching came from Gandhiji. Writing in *Young India*, he aptly said, 'Men like Lalaji cannot die so long as the sun shines in the Indian sky'. Lajpat Rai left a rich legacy for his countrymen whom he had loved and for whom he had suffered. It was a legacy of a true patriot, a relentless campaigner for freedom and an ardent religious and social reformer.

95. Jawaharlal Nehru, *An Autobiography*, (New Delhi, 1962), p. 174.
96. *Ibid.*, p. 175.

1. OPEN LETTERS TO SIR SYED AHMED KHAN

Would you excuse me if I encroach upon your valuable time for a short while ? Before I address you on the subject matter of discussion I think it advisable to state for your information that I have been a constant reader and admirer of your writings. From childhood, I was taught to respect the opinions and the teachings of the white-bearded Syed of Aligarh. Your *Social Reformer*[1] was constantly read to me by my fond father, who looked upon you as no less than a prophet of the nineteenth century. Your writings in the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*[2] and your speeches in Council and other public meetings, were constantly studied by me and preserved as a sacred trust by my revered parent. It was thus that I came to know that you once approved of the contents of John Stuart Mill's book on "Liberty," and it was thus that I came to know (if my memory does not deceive me) that the present Chief Justice of Hyderabad,[3] a staunch opponent of the National Movement, once translated Jeremy Bentham's book on "Utility" for the readers of your *Social Reformer*. Is it strange then that I have been astonished to read what you now speak and write about the "National Congress"? Any person, in my circumstances, would shout out. Times have changed and with them convictions ! Flattery and official cajoleries have blinded the eyes of the most far-seeing ; cowardice has depressed the souls of the foremost of seekers after truth, and high sounding titles and the favours of worldly governors have extinguished the fire of truth burning in many a noble heart. Is it not a sad spectacle

The 'Open Letters' originally appeared in the Urdu Weekly ***Kohi-Noor*** of Lahore. These were translated into English shortly before the Allahabad Session of the Indian National Congress in 1888 which was attended by Lala Lajpat Rai. At the suggestion of Allan Octavian Hume the 'Open Letters' were reproduced in a pamphlet.

The letters were written after Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had openly started a campaign against the Congress and advised his co-religionists to remain aloof from it.

to the men whose days are numbered, whose feet are almost in the grave, trying to root out all the trees planted with their own hands !

Under these circumstances, Syed Sahib, it is, surely, not strange if I ask what has been the cause of this lamentable change in you. Old age and exhaustion of faculties may, perhaps, have some share in causing you to forget what you once wrote and spoke. Has your memory lost its retentiveness, or is it the blindness of dotage which has permitted you to stray into your present unhappy position ?

If the former, I from amongst your old admirers will take upon myself the duty of reminding you of what, in moments of wisdom, was recorded and published by your pen and tongue, and this duty, I promise, I will fulfil with the utmost pleasure and with feelings of the highest satisfaction.

I will begin with your book on the "Causes of the Indian Revolt", which was written in 1858, though only translated and published in English in the year 1873. It may be worth while to note here that the translators of this were no others than Sir Auckland Colvin, the present Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, and Lieutenant-Colonel Graham, the writer of your biography[4]. In this book, after having tried to prove that the Mutiny of 1857 was no "religious war," nor the result of a preconcerted conspiracy, you say that "most men, I believe, agree in thinking that it is highly conducive to the welfare and prosperity of Government—indeed, that it is essential to its stability—that the people should have a voice in its Councils. It is from the voice of the people that Government can learn whether its projects are likely to be well received. The voice of the people can alone check errors in the bud and warn us of dangers before they burst upon and destroy us." To make the matter more clear you go on saying that "this voice, however, can never be heard, and this security never acquired, unless the people are allowed a share in the consultations of Government. The security of a government, it will be remembered, is founded on its knowledge of the character of the governed as well as on its careful observance of their rights and privileges." These are noble words, nobly spoken ; words of sterling honesty and independence of spirit. Can they bear any other meaning than that which attaches to that resolution of the National Congress which prays for the introduction of a representative element into the constitution of

our Legislative Councils ? Pray, tell me how can the people have a voice in the Councils of a Government if not by representation ? How can the people of a country have their voice constantly heard if not through representatives ? But, to leave no doubt on the subject, I will go on giving quotations in proof of my assertion, that you have yourself in former times strongly advocated the introduction of a representative element into the Legislative Councils of India. After laying much stress upon the necessity of a Government respecting the opinions of the people it governs, you say : "The evils which resulted to India from the non-admission of natives into the Legislative Councils of India were various.......It (*i. e.* the Government) could never hear, as it ought to have heard, the voice of the people on the laws and regulations which it passed." Again you say : "But the greatest mischief lay in this, that the people misunderstood the views and the intentions of the Government. They misapprehended every act." After this you proceed to say that "if Hindustanis had been in the Legislative Councils, they would have explained everything to their countrymen, and thus these evils which have happened to us would have been averted." In your opinion, as expressed there, this non-representation of the voice of the governed in the Legislative Council of the realm was "the one great cause" and the "origin of all smaller causes of dissatisfaction," Nay, further, not to leave any doubts in the matter, and to prove that in your book you even go to the length of saying that your countrymen should be selected to form an assembly like the English Parliament (which demand, at the time you advanced it, was certainly more premature than it now is, though the National Congress, with all the advantages that the country has had in the way of education and enlightenment since that miserable year of 1858, only advocates the partial introduction of a representative element in the Legislative Councils), I shall give some more extracts from the same work.

There you say : "I do not wish to enter here into the question as to how the ignorant and uneducated natives of Hindustan could be allowed a share in the deliberations of the Legislative Council, or as to how they should be selected to form an assembly like the English Parliament. These are knotty points. All I wish to prove is that such a step is not only advisable but absolutely necessary, and that the disturbances are due to the neglect of such a measure" Could clearer words be used than what have been quoted above ?

Is there any doubt as to their meaning ? Because if so, I shall be obliged to quote the exact Hindustani words used by you to express the ideas propounded in the above lines. But no, I do not suppose you can feel any doubt on that point, because the English rendering was undertaken by no others than Sir Auckland Colvin and Lieutenant-Colonel Graham, the former of whom, at least, is now being proclaimed (whether rightly or wrongly, God knows) as an opponent of the National Congress.

Sir Syed, does it not sound strange that the writer of the words above quoted should put himself forward as the leader of the anti-Congress movement ? Is it not one more proof of India's misfortune that the writer of the above words should impute bad motives to the supporters of the National Congress, mainly because they advocate the introduction of some sort of representation in the Legislative Councils of India ? Is not your charge of sedition against the promoters of the Congress, in the face of these, a mere mockery, a contradiction in terms ? Thirty years ago, you advocated the institution of a Parliament, and yet you chide us saying that we want an Indian Parliament, notwithstanding that we protest that for the present, and for a long time to come, we do not claim any such thing ? Mark the difference. India is no longer what it was thirty years ago. In the course of this period it has made a marked advance towards a higher civilization. The natives of India are no longer, with *very* few exceptions, ignorant or uneducated. The rays of education are penetrating and shedding their wholesome light inside most Indian homes ; hundreds of thousands of Indians are as well educated as any average English gentleman, and we see scores of our countrymen every year crossing the "black waters" to witness with their own eyes the proceedings of the great British Parliament and personally familiarize themselves with the political institutions of the English nation. Can you in face of these facts still call us "seditious" ? According to your writings, we are the most loyal subjects of the Government, and if, notwithstanding what you have written, you still deserve to be called "the ablest of our loyal Mahomedan gentlemen," why, we deserve not to be styled "as the ablest of the most loyal subjects of the English Government."

To give a still more clear idea of what you thought about the fitness of India for this sort of Government, I give one more extract to the point, and then I will have done with your old writings for

the present. After giving many arguments in proof of your position that the law which allowed the sales of land for arrears of Government revenue was also a cause of the outbreak of disturbances in 1858, you say: "A landed estate in Hindustan is very like a kingdom. It has always been the practice to elect one man as the head over all. By him matters requiring discussion are 'brought forward' (mind, not decided), and every shareholder, in proportion to his holding has the power of speaking out his mind on the point." You are wrong when you say "in proportion to his holding." However, let it remain as it is. You proceed and say: "The cultivators and the choudhries of the villages attend on such an occasion and say whatever they have to say. You have here, in great perfection a miniature kingdom parliament." How is it that now you have changed your mind and have come to opine that these kingdoms, as you called them, should have no voice in the making of laws which materially affect the person, the property and the reputation of the people ?

Some persons insinuate that these writings which I have quoted came from an honest, uncorrupted mind, at a time when the writer had no prospect of being raised to the Legislative Council by mere favour. No, Sir Syed, no ! I, on my own part, do not want to make such an insinuation against the fearless writer of those noble words which have been quoted above.

Then the problem to be solved remains the same, viz., why this change, why this inconsistency ? I pause for a reply, with a promise of more in my next, and in the meanwhile beg to be allowed to subscribe myself,

The Son of an old Follower of
Yours

27th October 1888

II

It is more than two weeks now since my first letter was published, and I think, I have waited long enough for the reply which, it seems, you have no mind to send. However, in fulfilment of my promise, I am bound to go on giving quotation after quotation, bringing home to you your own former political teachings, and I hope I shall be able clearly to prove that you once believed in all the principles upon which the different Resolutions of the National Congress are based. This will leave you no alternative but either

an open and unreserved confession of your apostacy or an unreserved retreat from politics.

Do not think, Sir Syed, that I shall rest satisfied with the publication of these letters in India. No, they will be duly published and distributed in free England, side by side with the pamphlets of your own pet Association[5] of yesterday.

In the book, already so often referred to, *i.e.* "The Causes of the Indian Revolt," you say: "Government were but slightly acquainted with the unhappy state of the people. How could it well be otherwise? There was no real communication between the Government and the governed, no living together or near one another, as has always been the custom of Mahomedans in countries which they subjected to their rule. Government and its officials have never adopted the course without which no real knowledge of the people can be gained." Further on you say that "this cannot be expected from the English, as they almost all look forward to retirement in their land, and seldom settle for good amongst the natives of India."

Now I take the liberty of asking has there been any improvement of late in this direction? Have the majority, or even one per cent. of the retired English officers, permanently settled in India? On the contrary, we find that they are birds-of-passage just as much now as, or perhaps more, than they were when the above sentences were written. Then, have the Englishmen and the natives taken to living together, or near one another? Do you ever see Englishmen living in the Mahallas of your towns, however large the towns or however respectable the Mahallas may be? None of the Englishmen have ever been seen doing that. In fact, their mode of living is so peculiar that they cannot. Or, do you think that the point has been gained by a few Anglicised natives like yourself having taken to living in bungalows? If that is what you argue, I assure you, you are sadly mistaken. Your living in Europeanized houses cannot be said to be a gain to native society. It is rather, if I may be allowed to say so, a very severe and deplorable loss. In the sentence quoted above, you admit that living together or near one another enhances our sympathies and gives us more occasions of seeing, mixing with, and obtaining a more intimate knowledge of each other. It is thus clear that Europeans can only really know us if they see us in our native homes, in our small thatched huts full

of misery and sickness. How poor and miserable India is, they can feel only if they live amongst or near the houses of our agriculturists, and there see with their own eyes respectable native families sleeping in rooms into which an English beggar would scorn to step. Why is this ? Is it because we Indians do not know how to live ? Now, if you say that, go to those Indian residences which are occupied by our few rich or even well-to-do countrymen, and there you will find that our mode of living is quite on a par with that of Europeans. Does any one then ask how it is that I say that repectable natives live, everywhere, in buildings which can only properly be called hovels ? The answer is, because they are miserably poor and cannot afford to build comfortable houses. Taxation is so high that they never feel themselves secure of their respectability. In fact, that is always in danger. The poor fellows are daily and nightly engaged in making the two ends meet. What I mean to say is tnat the fact of you or a few other natives having to live in bungalows and imitating the English customs of eating and drinking and dressing cannot do any good either to India or to England. In fact, this will never help the English to realize the unhappy state of the people. Then the question is, how can the Government know the wants and wishes of its subjects ? They cannot know them through official reports, because these reports are almost all prepared by persons who seldom see the real state of the people whom the reports concern. You yourself said : "But even these officials themselves were ignorant of the real thoughts and opinions of the people, because they had no means of getting at them" (*vide* your Biography by Colonel Graham, p. 49.) Then can the Government get this knowledge through the petitions of their subjects ? I say, as you said, *no*. You said that these petitions "were," and I say they *are*, "seldom if ever attended to and sometimes never heard" (*vide* the same page of your Biography). I add to this that even if they are ever attended to, enquiry into the allegations made in them is often entrusted to the same officials whose conduct forms the subject of complaint. Their reports are taken to be gospel truth and the petitions are thrown out.

Then, can the Government know the real opinion of the people through the Native press ? No, because the Government officials have always been hostile to it, and have ever asserted that these papers represented nobody but themselves.

Public meetings even are not effectual, because these are invariably declared to be the work of professional agitators, stump orators and wire-pullers.

The question then is, that admitting as you do, that it is essential for the purpose of good adminstration that the people should have a voice in the consultations of the Government, how should that voice reach the Council Chambers, and how should the people be consulted before laws are passed ? You once said that "laws affecting the subjects should be made after consultation with the representatives of the people" (*vide Social Reformer* of the 15th Shawwal 1290, Hijri, equivalent to the 6th December, 1873, p. 163), and there cannot be any other answer to this question. Further on you said : "I am very sorry that this is not being done in India, and in not doing so Government is in error to a certain degree, but in a larger measure it is owing to the incompetency of the subjects, but I am confident that after a certain period—sufficient education will remove both." (*Vide* the same Journal, same page). It is fifteen years now, Sir, since the above lines were written, and it is, surely, time to ask, or, at least, to consider, whether that period, or *chand roz*, to speak in your own words, has not expired yet. I am ready to concede, though it may be for argument's sake only that the period has not expired, but are we not making steady progress towards the desired end ? Your objections, unfortunately, are not based upon considerations of time, but are put forward as matters of principle. Then admitting, as you do, that this voice can only reach the Council Chamber through the representatives of the people, the only question to be solved is—who should be those representatives, or, in other words, how should they acquire that position ? Can men, like Raja Shiva Prashad[6] and yourself, be properly considered as representatives of the people, and can the method of selection, by which you were sent to the Council Chamber, be accepted as of any value ? I think no reasonable man would contend that it would have been possible, if Raja Shiva Prashad had been an elected representative of the people of India, for him to have libelled the whole Indian nation, as he did, in his notorious speech on the Ilbert Bill.[7] Could Raja Peary Mohan Mukerjee[8] and other native members have consented to the raising of the Salt tax if they had thought that their seats depended on the voices of the people, whose throats were, so to speak, to be cut by that abnoxious and inhumane measure ? Then

the correct solution is this and no other, that the people must be represented by delegates, elected by themselves ; and subject of course to the restrictions to be imposed by the Government. Co-sharers in the business of governing or legislating, these representatives must be such as to be totally independent of official favour or disfavour. If the selection of members for the Legislative Council is to be entrusted to officials, I say it is a downright farce, and there can be no representation.

The majority of the quotations given above come from a book which was written about thirty years ago, and you may find an excuse by saying that the state of people has since then undergone a mighty change, and that, in consequence of this, the remedies then suggested are no longer suitable. My dear Sir, this reply cannot stand a moment's examination. I am going to show that in 1881, which is only seven years ago, you held the same views and felt rather proud of them. When it was proposed to raise the old Punjab University College to the status of a University, you were one of the foremost opponents of the proposal. You, your admirers and followers, should not have forgotten that you wrote certain articles under the heading "Our Vernacular," and got them published and circulated in a pamphlet form. These articles were published in almost all the leading vernacular papers of Northern India, and the educated community of the Punjab, who were strongly opposed to the establishment of a University on the lines suggested by Dr. Leitner,[9] obtained effective support from these writings of "the ablest of the loyal Mahomedan gentlemen." In one of them (paper 2nd perhaps), which was published in your *Social Reformer* for 1297-98 Hijri (equivalent to 1881), at p.135, you say: "National progress and National Government are both sisters born of the same mother. When a nation loses its independence, its progress only depends upon its learning the language and sciences of Conquerors and thus taking a part in the Government of the country. By way of flattery whatever may be said, and as a matter of policy whatever may be stated, the fact is that *in reality the relations of Hindustanis to their rulers are no better than those of slaves to their master*." The italics are mine. I have tried to give a faithful translation of your Urdu sentences. If I have erred, I hope to be excused, and that my mistake may be pointed out. However, to satisfy the scruples of sceptical readers, I prefer to give the last

portion of the sentence in Roman characters and leave them to judge for themselves whether the rendering is correct or not. The original words are: *Khushamad ki baten jo chahe kah le, aur political tarique men jo kuchh beyan karna ho, keya jawe, magar Hindostanion ka hal apni fatahmand qaum ke sath gulami ke halat se kuchh ziyada nahin hai.* In the same article, further on, you said that the "University College was being raised to the status of a University with the object of throwing obstacles in the way of our National advancement, and that the result of the clamour after Oriental studies could be nothing but that of keeping ourselves in the state of serfdom."

Sir Syed, would you still call us "seditious"? Remember that we are the product of that education which you so strongly recommended and which you have never been known to condemn. Our English education, the study of eminent European minds and European sciences—alas! that you cannot feel this—has expanded our souls, and we can no longer be selfish "Sat Bachnia" prodigies of your Oriental language. Sir, your fall seems to remind me of the fall of Adam. Just as Satan is said to be the cause of the fall of that progenitor of our race, this seeking after worldly honours seems to be real explanation of your decline. It is nothing to you, because your term in this world must at no very distant period expire; but to us, who are yet, we hope, to live long and to fight out the bloodless battle of liberty, it is destined to remain a permanent disgrace. The line of argument against us would be that the races which produce such inconsistent philosphers are not fit to receive the boon of Local Self-Government. Sir Syed, if you have changed your political opinions, the sooner you announce it the better it will be, both for yourself and for us. It is simply childish to persist in your claim to consistency in the face of the above quotations. Better announce this change and explain why and how this took place. Again pausing for a reply, with a promise of more in my next, I beg to subscribe myself.

The Son of an old Follower
of Yours

15th November 1888

III

Well may we apply the opening sentence of Dicken's *Tale of Two Cities* to the present times in India. Well may we say that it is "the best of times" as well as "the worst of times." Best as the

country is on the point of having a nation, worst as a particular section of the community wants to check the progress of the country and unfortunately is headed, or at least is said to be headed, by a man who has been a frequent advocate of representative Government in India. It is "the age of wisdom" as the country has risen from its deep lethargy and made up its mind to assist the Government by wise counsels. It is "the age of foolishness" as a particular party has the audacity to believe that their opposition will cause the national movement to die in its infancy. It is "the epoch of belief" because the different sectional interests have begun to believe in each other's sincerity ; it is "the epoch of incredulity" because you, Sir, are said to be now-a-days against the introduction of a representative element into the Legislative Councils of India. It is the "spring of hope" when we see eminent English statesmen advocating the rights of the dumb millions of India. It is the "winter of despair" when we see her own sons deserting the cause of awakened India.

Sir Syed, I must remind you that it is the same India for the welfare of whose sons you established "The Siddor's Union Club"[10] at Aligarh. Do you remember, Sir, that in that Club the alumni of the Mahomedan College were trained in the art of discussing public matters in public councils? I ask you, Sir, why you established that Club? Why did you formulate those rules of discussion which predict the establishment of representative institutions in the country? Oh, if we had only known that it was to end in this ! I feel that I have gone astray and must look to those extracts from your writings and sayings so dear to me, which foretold the establishment of representative Councils in India.

Will you please turn to page 49 of your Biography by Lieutenant-Colonel Graham where you are described as saying: "The people were isolated, they had no champion to stand up for their rights and to see justice done them, and they were constrained to weep in silence." Can you in the face of these words still say that the people never needed such champions, and that the Government has been doing and will go on doing without demand what it has thought and what it will think necessary for the welfare of the people? That it never needed the voice of such champions for the redress of grievances and the attainment of rights?

Having pointed out what the Government ought to have done to make itself popular (quotations as to which have been given in letters Nos. I and II) you said in the end of the same book, "The Causes of Indian Revolt," that "it was necessary for the Government to win the friendship and the goodfeeling of its subjects." Further on you said: "As yet, truth compels me to state, Government has not cultivated the friendship of its people as was its duty to do......the father loves his child before the child loves him......If a man of low degree tries to win the esteem of one in high position he is liable to be styled a flatterer and not a friend. It was, therefore, for Government to try and win the friendship of its subjects, not for the subjects to try and win that of the Government.......If Government say that what I say is untrue—that they have tried to cultivate friendship and have only been repaid with enmity—I can only say that if it had gone the right way to work, its subjects would most undoubtedly have been its friends and supporters instead of, as in many instances, rising up in arms against it. Now, friendship is a feeling which springs from the heart and which cannot be kindled by 'admonitions.'......Government has hitherto kept itself as isolated from the people of India as if it had been the fire and they the dry grass—as if it thought that, were the two brought in contact the latter would be burnt up."

I have given this large quotation to recall to your mind some of the reasons upon which you formed the opinions which I have already quoted in my letters Nos. I and II. These reasons may also go to prove that the prayers of the National Congress as to the concession of volunteering to be allowed to the native subjects of Her Majesty are nothing but reasonable and consistent with the noble principles involved in the above lines. Now I have done with your book on "The Causes of Indian Revolt" so far as it concerned that resolution of the National Congress which prays for the introduction of a representative element in the Legislative Councils of India. Most of these extracts, except one or two here and there, were abstract, and perhaps you may, with your usual calmness, have the boldness to say that there is nothing in these quotations which goes to prove that you ever meant to say that these representatives to the Council of India should be elected by the subjects. Very good, I will search out quotations which will leave nothing doubtful. You may not have forgotten that

two months after the opening of your Scientific Society you delivered "a vigorous speech" at the laying of the foundation stone of the New Gazhipore, now the Victoria College. In the course of that address you said: "Bear in mind, gentlemen, that Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria has had proclaimed in this country that her servants and subjects, European and native, are to be considered as being on an equal footing; *and this assurance, gentlemen, is not a mere matter of form but a reality.*" The italics are mine. Now, Sir Syed Ahmed, will you still laugh at us because we believe this—this very proclamation—to be our Magna Charta ?

Further on in the course of the same address you said : "The appointment of Natives to the Supreme Council was a memorable incident in the History of India. The day is not far distant I trust and when it does come you will remember my words when that council will be composed of representatives from every division or district, and that thus the Laws which it will pass will be laws enacted by the feelings of the entire country."

"You will see that this cannot come to pass unless we strive to educate ourselves thoroughly. I once had a conversation with one in high authority on this very subject, and he said that Government would be only too glad if a scheme, such as I have sketched above, were practicable, but he felt doubtful; if it were stated that there were qualified men in every District, Government would gladly avail itself of their knowledge and give them seats in Council. I knew this only too well and felt ashamed that such was the case. What I have above stated is only to inculcate on your minds the great fact that Her Most Gracious Majesty wishes all her subjects to be treated alike; and let their religion, tribe, or colour be what it may, the only way to avail ourselves of the many roads to fame and usefulness is to cultivate our intellects and to conform ourselves to the age." Sir Syed, have the happiness to know that the day, which you in 1864 said was not far distant is coming nearer, and that you need no longer feel so much ashamed of your countrymen for not conforming to the age. Your prophecy is not fulfilled yet, but we are certain that sometime or other it is sure to be fulfilled, and then you will have the satisfaction of feeling that you did not prophesy in vain. Sir Syed, do you wish to withdraw this prophesy of yours, and if so why ? Please explain—I and others like me are waiting in suspense. Only say that with the return of sobriety and the calmness of old age you have

come to know your own errors, and we will no more trouble you with these prophecies. Sir Syed, would you please point out what else could be the meaning of the above sentence except that, that India would some (in 1864, not far distant) day be governned by Councils composed of members elected by the people themselves? If not this, how can the laws be said to be "enacted by the feelings of the entire country."

Two months before you spoke the words quoted above, you, on the 9th January, 1864, started a Translation Society now known as the Scientific Society of Aligarh; and in the course of a speech then delivered pointing out the ignorance of your countrymen you said: "From their ignorance of the events of the past, and also of the events of the present—from their not being acquainted with the manner and means by which infant nations have grown into powerful and flourishing ones, and by which the present most advanced ones have beaten their competitors in the race for position among the magnates of the world—they are unable to take lessons and profit by their experience." Sir, we took your advice, and your countrymen have learnt the means and the manner by which they can advance the growth of their "infant nation" to the position of a "powerful" and a "flourishing" one. How is it that this growth which you so much desired in 1864 is an eyesore to you now? How is it that now at this period you cannot feel any pleasure in seeing a combination of all the different races and sects towards the accomplishment of the great end for which you have been until recently struggling so hard. How is it that you are going to prove that you did not deserve the distinctions so deservedly, as we thought, bestowed upon you? By your present attitude, by your present utterances, you mean to prove that all that you once said, all that you once did, for which you were rightly honoured both by the Government and the people, and for which you were said to be deserving of being "awarded a conspicuous place on the list of benefactors" of India, was, after all, but utter nonsense—because that is the phrase you now apply to the repetition of those same principles which you once so strenuously advocated—by the supporters of the National Congress.

On the 10th of May, 1886, you addressed a large and influential meeting of the European and native residents of Aligarh on the

necessity of Indian affairs being more prominently brought before Parliament and of forming an association for this purpose (at least so says your biographer on pp.88 and 89). In the course of this speech you compared the British rule with that of the "former emperors and Rajas" of India. You said "it" (*i.e.* the rule of the latter) "was based upon nothing but tyranny and oppression; the law of might was that of right; the voice of the people was not listened to; the strong and the turbulent, oppressed the feeble and the poor, and usurped all their privileges with impunity for their own selfish ends. It is only therefore by such usurpers and turbulent spirits that a despotism, such as flourished in Hindustan for many long centuries, is at all to be desired." Know, sir, that the National Congress wants nothing but that voice of the people be listened to, and that the strong and turbulent" may not oppress "the feeble and the poor." The National Congress wants to achieve these ends by peaceful means and in fact by prayers; while it can only be the usurpers and the turbulent who desire to threaten, as you now do, the use of arms. It can only be the self-assumed "strong" who can threaten "the poor" with the use of the arms, by "the followers of the prophet." Further on you regretted the indifference, with which the affairs of India were treated in the Parliament, and laid the blame of it to a great extent upon the shoulders of your own countrymen. You said: "India, with that slowness to avail herself of that which would benefit her so characteristic of Eastern nations has hitherto looked on Parliament with a dreamy apathetic eye, content to have her affairs, in the shape of her Budget, brought before it in an annual and generally inaudible speech by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India." You entreated your countrymen to discontinue this apathy, and you asked them to exert themselves towards securing the proper representation of their interest in the governing body of the British Nation. You appealed to the "entire native community" "to co-operate" with the London Association[11] established for the purpose. To your countrymen you continued to say: "You will have only yourselves to reproach when in after years you see the European section of the community enjoying their well-earned concessions whilst your wants remain still unmet." Sir Syed, the country then responded to your call, though imperfectly, and it is now that

the country has felt the value of your words and begun to throw away the deep indifference which you so forcibly lamented. Pray will you tell me whether, prior to the movement of National Congress, there was no agitation for the redress of the grievances of the Indians in India? If so what was all this which you were doing? Why did you establish and support all these associations? Why did you call upon the entire country to "co-operate" with these associations if the Government had of its own accord been doing all that was needed for the welfare of India? In your criticism upon the Lucknow speech of the Hon'ble Pandit Ajudhia Nath[12] of Allahabad you meant to ask (if I did not err in understanding and reproducing it from memory) the Congress-wallahs if any of their agitations had been existing when the Government granted all the boons which we enjoy. I have quoted largely from your own writings to show that such an agitation did exist, and that you yourself were one of the most prominent agitators. You even went to the length of saying that no fear need be entertained of your (*i.e.*, of those who meant to take part in such associations, &c.) being called discontented by the Government. To quote your own words you said: "I am afraid that a feeling of fear—fear that the Government or the district authorities would esteem you factious and discontented, were you to inaugurate a measure like this—deters you from coming forward for your country's good.... Believe me that this moral cowardice is wrong—the apprehension unfounded, and that there is not an Englishman of a liberal turn of mind in India who would regard with feelings other than those of pleasure and hope, such a healthy sign of increased civilization on the part of its inhabitants. The natives have at present little or no voice in the management of the affairs of their country, and should any measure of Government prove obnoxious to them, they brood over it, appearing outwardly satisfied and happy while discontent is rankling in their mind." Further on you said that the natives were in the habit of inveighing against such measures in their homes, but to the Europeans they represented that they were satisfied with the justice and wisdom of these very measures. You loudly proclaimed "that such a state of affairs is inimical to the welfare of the country. Far better would it be for India were her people openly and honestly to express their opinions as to the justice or otherwise of the acts of Government." Would

you pray tell me, Sir, why we are sedition-mongers; is it because we speak "honestly" as to the justice or otherwise of the acts of the Government; is it because we have overcome the moral cowardice with which you charged us? Are we seditious because we do not want to keep "discontent rankling" within our hearts? Are we disloyal because we, according to your own teachings, have come forward to speak up for our country's good? If we deserve all these epithets on account of all these I must say, Sir, that you are the father of all this. You taught us to do exactly what we have begun doing now. You not only taught but encouraged us by your own example. Why do you now deprecate "this healthy sign of civilization", as you once called it, on the part of Indians? If we, the followers of your old principles, have exceeded the proper dimension which, I humbly maintain, we have not, it is surely not advisable to root out these instincts from within us, but rather to point out the place and the occasion where we have exceeded. How have you come to oppose the principles themselves, the principles so lovingly promulgated by you? Say that the principles are not to be discarded, but the men abusing these principles are to be despised. We will then know how to love the principles and not the men. We loved you because you held these principles, because we thought you loved your country above everything, because we considered you to be one of the fathers of the present India, and if we have erred we must say we think that you should have pointed out our error in time. Truly has a poet said *Khwab tha jo kuchh ki dekha tha afsana tha jo kuchh ke suna tha, i.e.*, "What I saw was but a dream, what I heard an idle tale." Ah! human delusions are then destined to delude the human eye for ever !

Again with a pause, with a promise of more in my next.

I am yours, &c.,

22nd November 1888 The Son of an old Follower of Yours

IV.

The fourth meeting of the Indian National Congress is soon to be held at Allahabad, and so I think I must hasten to give some more of the most important quotations in this letter of mine. The less important ones I leave for some future occasion.

When this letter reaches you, you will be, possibly smiling over the ex-Viceroy's speech delivered at the St. Andrews' Dinner, Calcutta.[13] If you will only take the trouble of reading that speech with your eyes open, you will find that your uproar against the introduction of some representative element in the Legislative Councils of India is not liked even by those whom you have undertaken to flatter, and whose national traditions you try to belie.

Sir Syed, for God's sake, reconsider your position and do not disappoint us just when the morning of hope has begun to dawn over us and our mother-land.

Now to proceed with your old writings and sayings; please turn to pages 207 and 208 of your *Social Reformer* for 1298 Hijri, equivalent to the year 1881 A. D. There, while giving an account of your voyage to London, you said that on the way you happened to see Mr. D. Fitzpatrick, the former Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, with whom you talked about "goodness or badness of the Punjab administration." Therein you profess to have said that the Government of the Punjab was a *despotic* one, though a thousand times better than that of the Sikhs. Further on you say "the people of the Punjab may be happy and perhaps may like it because they have been just taken out of fire and made to sit in the sun. But we cannot like it. The goodness or badness of the Punjab Government *i.e.* of the Government of the non-Regulation Provinces, should be asked of the inhabitants of Delhi, Panipat, Rohtak, Hissar and Sirsa districts, which once used to belong to Regulation Provinces and have now been subjected to a non-Regulation (or *beqanuni*) Punjab Administration.[14] As far as I know people think that of many other punishments, which had been awarded to the inhabitants of Delhi and its adjacent districts in the Mutiny, this was also one that they were made over to the Government of the Punjab and thus made the subjects of non-Regulation Provinces." These lines were written at a time when the North-Western Provinces did not enjoy the blessing of having a Provincial Legislature of its own, and so the only superiority in the administration of the N.W.P over that of the Punjab then, was the existence of a High Court instead of the Chief Court in the Punjab, and the constitution of a Board of Revenue instead of a Financial Commissionership here. The word "*Despotic*" is your own, and is used in your Urdu style, and thus you cannot say that the word has been unwittingly thrust upon you by the translator. Even at the risk of unidiomatic English I have tried to give a

literal translation of your Urdu sentences. If you think that this translation is incorrect, I trust you will not, for the sake of your own reputation, fail to publish a true translation of the sentences quoted. Now, will you please explain on what principles you designated the Government of the Punjab as despotic, and how you distinguished it in that respect from the Government of India or that of N.W.P. ? I can venture to say that the Government of the Punjab was never more despotic than the Governments of other sister Provinces. No doubt the merit of each Government to a considerable degree depends upon the personal character of its head. The Governments of Montgomery, Aitchison and even that of Sir James Lyall cannot be said to be more despotic than that of any of the Governors of other Provinces. Can you, Sir, in the face of this broad accusation of yours, still designate us as reckless accusers of Government and its policy ? Further on in the same article you go on saying : "In fact the present time is not one in which people may like a despotic Government, nor are those virtues (which in ancient times used to be mixed with a thousand vices) of a despotic Government, and by which the influence of the former were an antidote for the latter, to be found in these days. Now-a-days it is not possible for those virtues to exist in any despotic Government, and the people who think that in India a despotic Government, such as it used to be in by-gone times, would be more appropriate and useful than the constitutional form of Government, are greatly mistaken. They are just like one who judges a garden by its state in the autumn without caring to think what it will be in the spring." The word "despotic" throughout this quotation is your own, Sir.

At another place, on page 132 of the same journal for the same year, under the heading of the Eastern Arts and Sciences, you exhort us not to devote ourselves to them but to the study of Western ones. You ask us even "to forget our mother-tongue" (an impossibility in itself) because you said our national advancement only "depended upon the spread of Western Sciences." You said, "Let us by all means remain loyal to the Government, let us always regard it to be our patron and well-wisher, and let us at the same time try to extricate ourselves from that servile and savage state in which we are." Nobly and truly did you say that this, and this only, should be the subject of a generous kind-hearted Government who rules over a nation for the good of the latter, or, say, for the good of the human race. In the course of the same article on the same

page of your *Tahzib-ul-Ikhlaq* you say "no nation can ever advance in parallel lines all travelling from one point to another. Nations always advance in the shape of a triangle, whose one corner projects in advance of the others. To think that we may not be divided in different sects is to pray that we may not be enlightened by the light of Western ideas." In contrast to this, please reconsider your Meerut speech[15], in which in fact you wanted to express that the whole nation must remain in the background because *you think* that the Mahomedan community has not sufficiently advanced to fully reap the benefits to be enjoyed by the granting of the boons prayed for by the National Congress. (I do not admit that the Mahomedan community is not sufficiently advanced.)

On page 136 of the same Journal you say, "I sincerely believe and wish to assure the Government that the same discontented educated critics" (meaning those educated gentlemen who severely criticize the Government measures and who are blamed for it) "yield to none in their appreciation of the British rule; hence it is not just to effect the ruin of our education on account of any apprehension of such criticism." These are the words which you addressed to those politicians who advocate the closing of Government Colleges and schools, and who are of opinion that education in Western ideas and sciences has made the Indians disloyal. You would, I suppose, like to re-read those words also by which you encourage your own educated countrymen to fight out the battle of their national advancement bravely and without fear. You say, "Without doubt, there are many difficulties in the way of our doing so" (*i. e.*, promulgating those blessings of education, instruction and enlightenment which we acquire in those civilized countries to which we go on completing our education). "On one side we are to contend against the prejudices and ignorance of our own countrymen, and on the other side we are to bear the opposition of those narrow-minded men of the conquering race to whom our social and political advancement is an eyesore, and who dislike us because we have adopted English life, English politics and the manners of an English gentleman; and change of dress even infuriates them to such a degree that they look at us with angry eyes as a pious man looks at a great criminal. But we should keep the good of our nation at heart and should bear all the difficulties and troubles which beset our way with the greatest possible forbearance and perseverance. I do not wish to conceal

that Time, the Great Reformer, will let all these things be, and no opposition or discontent will be able to keep them back. But still there is no doubt that this norrow-mindedness is kindling the feelings of discontent, and is surely calculated to cause all sympathy and love between the governors and the governed to be banished." Sir Syed, have the happiness to learn that your countrymen took you to be a true prophet, that they are going to stick to every word which you wrote—are not to be daunted or baffled by any opposition, no, not even by yours. How is it that you preached to us to persevere and yourself could not do this? We have persevered, but the old man has fallen; what a pitiable spectacle of human weakness !

Next I will give an extract upon the great question of native volunteers with which one of the Resolutions of the National Congress deals. On page 332 of your Biography, says your Biographer, that in March, 1883, when Mr. A. O. Hume (the beloved General Secretary of the National Congress) advocated the cause of native volunteers in India, and stated that in the *Mutiny* he had a brigade of infantry, cavalry and artillery in the Etawah yeomanry levy—all Volunteers—he (*i.e.* Lieutenant-Colonel Graham) addressed a letter to the Editor of the *Pioneer* in which he tried to rebut many of the arguments advanced by Mr. Hume, which letter he says brought you (Sir Syed Ahmed) down upon him in a letter which you wrote to him. He gives an extract from that letter on page 334, which runs thus, "I have perused your reply to Mr. Hume's letter advocating the volunteering of the Natives of India. In not allowing the natives to become Volunteers, the Government mean to say that they do not trust the Natives of India. Its consequences should be judged from the saying : 'If you want us to trust you, you should also trust us.' There yet exists a wide gulf between the Europeans and the Natives of India, and unless it be filled up *nothing can secure and improve the prosperity of the country*." The italics are mine. This you wrote in the middle of 1883, and now in 1887 and 1888, you say Indians do not want anything. On the same page Lieutenant-Colonel Graham writes as follows : "What I would advocate would be the selection by the local authorities in all large stations in India of a certain number of picked Native Volunteers—men of good family and well-known for their loyalty—to be placed under the command of the Officer commanding the European Volunteers. I would let them select their own company officers, and once started I would also permit them to select their own recruits as vacancies occurred."

I say "give us this much and we will be satisfied for a lon time to come."

A few important extracts more and I will have done with your old writings and sayings for the present. Contrast the meanings attached to the words "Nation" and "National" by you in your Meerut speech with those promulgated by yourself at Gurdaspur on the 27th of January, 1884. At Gurdaspur you said that "we (*i.e.*, the Hindus and Mahomedans) should try to become one heart and soul and act in unison; if united we can support each other. If not, the effect of one against the other would tend to the destruction and downfall of both. In old historical books and traditions you will have read and heard, and we see it even now, that all the people inhabiting one country are designated by the term one *nation.* The different tribes of Afghanistan are termed as one nation, and so are the miscellaneous hordes peopling Iran, distinguished by the term. Europeans, though abounding in variety of thoughts and religions, are still known as members of one nation, though people of other countries also do come and settle with them, but being mixed together they are called members of one and the same nation. So that from the oldest times the word Nation is applied to the inhabitants of one country, though they differ in some peculiarities which are characteristic of their own. Hindu and Mahomedan brethren, do you people any country other than Hindustan ? do you not inhabit the same land ? are you not burned and buried on the same soil? do you not tread the same ground and live upon the same soil? Remember that the words Hindu and Mahomedan are only meant for religious distinction—otherwise all persons, whether Hindu or Mahomedan, even the Christians who reside in this country are all in this particular respect belonging to one and the same nation. Then all these different sects can only be described as one nation; they must each and all unite for the good of the country which is common to all."

Again in your Lahore speech, which was delivered in reply to the address of the Indian Association of Lahore, you, on the 3rd of February, 1884, said as follows : "Even granting that the majority of those composing this Association are Hindus, still I say that this light has been diffused by the same whom I call by the epithet of Bengalees. I assure you that Bengalees are the only people in our country whom we can properly be proud of and it is only due to them that knowledge, liberty and patriotism

have progressed in our country. I can truly say that really they are the head and crown of all the different communities of Hindustan. I myself was fully cognizant of all those difficulties which obstructed my way, but notwithstanding these I heartily wished to serve my country and my nation faithfully. In the word Nation I include both Hindus and Mahomedans because that is the only meaning which I can attach to it (*i.e.* Nation or *quam*)." Here in the end, the word nation is originally used by yourself. (See the account of your trip to the Punjab by Maulvi Iqbal Ali, p.167, line 18th). To resume: "With me it is not so much worth considering what is their religious faith, because we do not see anything of it. What we do see is that we inhabit the same land, are subject to the rule of the same Governors, the fountains of benefits for all are the same, and the pangs of famine also we suffer equally. These are the different grounds upon which I call both those races which inhabit India by one word, *i.e.* Hindu, meaning to say that they are the inhabitants of Hindustan. While in the Legislative Council, I was always anxious for the prosperity of this nation." This letter of mine has already exceeded its proper dimensions, and therefore I think I must not give more extracts, and must leave the rest to be commented upon by abler hands than mine.

Anybody reading these extracts will be once for all convinced of the former loftiness and present *lowness* of your *position*. Foreigners reading these extracts will not believe that your now famous Meerut and Lucknow speeches were in reality delivered by the same Sir Syed Ahmed Khan who was once proud (whether rightly or wrongly, God knows) of his broadmindedness. This much seems certain: either you were not the author of those ideas reproduced in the above quotations, or your recent utterances were inspired by some mind other than your own*. Poor Sir Syed, you must feel sorry for all this inconsistency, though you may not have the boldness to say so. Sir, I assure you that you

* Can it be that your once massive, manly intellect has succumbed to the feeble, schoolgirl-like sophistries of your shallow-pated employer? That Merlin-like, the great heart that once beat true for India is now pulseless, and that you lie bound, inextricably, by the treacherous spells of a modern Vivient, even more despicable than his female prototype?

should not despair; a small sacrifice at the altar of your country, a renewed profession of the faith that was once in you will suffice to regain for you the confidence of your countrymen. If you are not prepared to do so, I must think myself justified in impeaching you in the name of consistency, in the name of honesty and fair play, in the name of the great Mahomed whose descendant and follower you profess to be, in the name of Mahdi Ali, your old devoted friend who once felt proud of showing to the world that the original Mahomedan rule was based upon democratic principles (see your *Social Reformer* for 1290 Hijri, p.136, lines 8 to 23); and lastly in the name of the pupils of your own Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh, whom you trained in the principles which you now affect to detest. It is a year since you actually engaged yourself in creating and keeping up an opposition to the National Congress[16] but up to this time your countrymen have not been clearly enlightened as to what it is that you object to in the proceedings of the National Congress. You say we are not fit for a republic and so do we say. You say we are not yet fit for a Parliament and so do we say.

If you say that the introduction of some representative element even into the Government would be injurious to our community, we ask why and how, and pray when did you receive that revelation because up to 1884 you yourself acknowledged the necessity of these Legislative Councils being reconstituted upon some representative basis. Then, again, when were you inspired with the idea that the Hindu and the Mahomedan interests are sure to clash at least in this respect ? Because up to 1884 you believed in the doctrine of Hindus and Mahomedans having one and the same political interests and being members of one and the same nation. To your friends Maulvies Mahdi Ali and Mahdi Hussain, whose tergiversation is not less amazing than your own, I have only a few words to say. To the former that he had better now suppress his lecture published in the *Social Reformer* for 1290 Hijri on pp.136 and those preceding and following it. To the latter that he should now publicly recant the views set forth in his article under the heading of "Liberty" published in your *Social Reformer* for 1298 Hijri, 1881, from pp.231 to 341. Until they do this I will ask them to abstain, if they desire any human being to credit them with common honesty, from abusing us and denouncing our

principles, and to my other countrymen as well as to our rulers. I have only to say further—

"I know a maiden fair to see,
Take care,
She can both false and friendly be,
Beware ! Beware !
Trust her not,
She is fooling thee.
She has two eyes so soft and brown,
Take care.
She gives a side-glance and looks down.
Beware ! Beware !
Trust her not
She is fooling thee !
And she has hair of a golden hue,
Take care !
And what she says is not true,
Beware ! Beware !
Trust her not,
She is fooling thee,
She has a bosom as white as snow,
Take care !
She knows how much it is best to show.
Beware ! Beware !
Trust her not,
She is fooling thee."

With a promise to begin afresh in the year 1889,

I beg to subscribe myself, Sir,

Yours. &c., &c.,

20th December 1888 The Son of an Old Follower of Yours

N.B.—The extracts from your "Social Reformer" and the account of your trip to the Punjab by Maulvi Iqbal Ali have been translated into English for the purposes of these letters by myself. L.R.

2. THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL PROGRESS

HAVING BEEN a constant reader of Indian journals, and an active sympathiser with the so-called Indian political party for the last twenty years, since the beginning of my University career, I have come to the conclusion that the Indian political party has accepted the expression "politics" to be synonymous with "agitation". Agitation, constant, unending agitation for political rights, may be one of the means to be adopted by a nation to obtain them; but agitation alone cannot express what is summed up in the word "politics". Agitation only deals with the present and is based on current events. The weight that is to be attached to it must be derived from the facts and figures supplied by the present or by its immediate past. But politics concerns itself with the building up of the nation with a view to its future. It calls to its aid the past and the present, imagines and designs the future, and then proceeds to find materials for the construction of the latter. As such, it is a religion, and a science, much higher, both in its conception and in its sphere, than mere political agitation. The true politician, as I understand the word, has a creed or faith; the agitator has none. The latter has "instincts, passions, often genuine in their origin, but easily deviated, or corrupted by disappointments or the seductions of power, as soon as years have cooled his enthusiasm and his youthful blood." The politician is one "to whom observation has shown the existence of a grave social grievance or immorality, to whom intelligence has shown a remedy, and to whom the voice of conscience, enlightened by a religious conception of the human mission here below, has revealed the inexorable duty of devoting himself to the application of the remedy and extirpation of the evil. The agitator, or the reactionist, as the writer whom I am quoting calls him, is "one urged by a sentiment of rebellion against injustice

Reproduced from the *East and West* (Simla) Volume I. August 1902.

innate intminds (sic) gifted with any power and very often by the pain and irritation consequent on being unable to assume his true place in the social order, to seek to better his own condition with the help of all who suffer under similar distress." The true politician "will pursue his forward march, whatever his individual position be, so long as the evil endures. The agitator will probably stop short as soon as the overthrow of the power attacked shall have satisfied his self-love and mitigated the sense of rebellion within him." The aim of the one is always to found, that of the other is to destroy. The first is a man of progress, the second of opposition. "With the first it is a question of principle, while the second glories in details. The first has a constructive programme, while the second resorts to that analysis which only decomposes and dissolves. The true politician may fail to achieve his aim; but if he succeeds once, his success is permanent, while the victories of a mere agitator, though sometimes brilliant, are not sure to be durable. The former invokes duty first and then rights, the latter invokes rights first and then duty. The acts of the former are influenced by a strong religious leaning, even when, through an intellectual contradiction, he professes the reverse, while the latter is irreligious and materialist, even when he proffers the name of God; with him, *i. e.*, the latter, the present always tops the future, and material interest takes precedence of moral progress. The men of the first class, accustomed to willing sacrifice, labour less for the generation that lives around them than for the generations to come; the triumph of the ideas they cast upon the world is slow, but infallible and decisive; the men of the second class often win victories for their contemporaries, but their children enjoy none of the fruits. The first are the prophets of humanity, the second are the mere agitators of mankind." An agitation can always be met with a counter-agitation, and thereby rendered powerless, but principles are irresistible, and none can demolish them, if true. The future of India requires the services of politicians, and not those of mere agitators. The future of the nation requires solidity of principles and purity of methods as its basis, and not mere diplomatic make-shifts or doubtful tactics. India wants men who, whether in good fortune or in bad fortune, not minding temporary reverses or difficulties, will lead her right through the goal, who will neither feel buoyant through the flush of preliminary success, nor feel daunted by temporary failures. Such are the men that are wanted to found and lead the Indian political party; not men of power, not men of riches, nor

men of titles, but men of conscience, men of energy, men of will, men who do not know how to give way to temptation or allurements, or how to be cowed down by threats and dangers; and last, but not least, men who do not know how to acknowledge a defeat. Let them chalk out a faith, a programme and their countrymen, many of whom are ardent in their love for their country, will kiss their feet and follow them right through, in good luck or in bad luck. The first thing that a politician has thus to do is to consult the future of his nation, so far as his vision can reach, and then to devise the means by which future, as imagined by him, can be reached. The second thing which a politician has to do, is to choose his creed and promulgate it. Let him first determine whether he is an absolute monarchist, a democrat or one for constitutional monarchy; because it is only then that he can, if at all, think of the proper methods which are to lead the nation to the desired end and because, in any case, the nation has to fit itself for its destiny. As the aim is, so must the means be. The political vision of the Indians, just now, only sees constitutional monarchy within its horizon, and from the very nature of things they cannot, for a long time to come, extend their horizon further. Before them is the spectacle of a nation ruled by a constitutional monarchy, happy, prosperous and politically great. This nation rules over them, and although itself subject to constitutional monarchy, it rules India in the spirit of an absolute despotic monarchy. The only difference is that here in India this despotism does not rest in one individual, but in a class. The first duty of an Indian politician, therefore, even if he is a democrat, is to prepare the nation to be fit to ask for a constitution, and to do so with reason. The first necessary step is not to go in for this demand, or to settle the form of the demand, but to create those forces the operation of which will justify the nation in advancing its claims. In my humble opinion, the first axiom which every Indian politician ought to take to heart, is that no nation is worthy of any political status if it cannot distinguish between begging such rights and claiming them. A beggar can be turned out of doors without redress, but one who has to be respected as a creditor cannot. No debtor can honestly and effectively ignore a creditor, but every charitably inclined man can ignore a beggar whom he does not like, or whom he does not consider deserving. No one can deny that, just now, ours is a position of beggars. We live on the charity of our rulers. They not only rule over us, but it is

they who think for us, who manufacture for us, who preach to us, and who provide for us.

In a self-governed country, or in a healthy body politic, the Government and its subjects are one and interchangeable. They have their respective and correlative duties and rights. In a country governed by foreigners, the rulers and the subjects are not one. But the aim of all true politicians ought to be to bring about this unity. The great gulf between the subjects and their rulers can only be bridged by bringing the former up to the level of the latter in intelligence, in culture, in moral calibre, in capacity for self-sacrifice and in subordination to high ideals. The nearer the mass of subjects approach their rulers in these qualities, the easier the solution of the political problem. The nearer you reach them, the smaller the number of those duties which really belong to the subjects : but which, in the present state of society, have to be performed by the State. In a perfect commonwealth the real sovereignty rests with the people. The State exists for them and rules in their name, and thus has a smaller and more limited volume of rights than those vested in the so called subjects. Hence, real political progress consists in befitting the nation to take up those duties which, though at present performed by the ruling class, ought in a state of political health, to be discharged by the people themselves The position thus analysed resolves itself into an educational problem. View it from whatever point you choose, religious, moral, intellectual, social, or industrial, the question of India's progress is a question of education. This is, so to say, the question of questions upon the right solution of which hang the destinies of the nation, viz., how to educate the people so as to befit them for the performance of those duties, a proper discharge of which alone can secure for them their position in the commonwealth.

But let my countrymen remember that this momentous question of the day is not one which can be solved by speeches and resolutions only. We must be prepared to undergo great sacrifices, if we are really earnest about the future of the country, and should put our united shoulders to the wheel, to drag the car of progress to its destination, cost what it may.

The car is a heavy one, and those who care to join in carrying it must be men of strong convictions, indomitable will, irresistible energy and untiring perseverance; they must be men of action and

men of honour. Let us resolve to spare all we can by living simple lives, for furthering the cause of true education in this country, as it is only useful, solid and all-covering education upon which the nation can build a character and establish a claim to be the arbiter of its own fortunes. No amount of sacrifice ought to be too great to attain this end, and the sooner we realise this, the better for ourselves as well as for the nation at large.

3. THE RELIGIOUS UNITY OF HINDUISM

IT IS OFTEN said that Hinduism is not the name of a particular religion, nor that of a religious nationality, and that it does not represent one set of beliefs, common to all who call themselves Hindus, and that therefore it is perfectly idle to appeal to the Hindus in the name of a common nationality. It has become almost a fashion to insist that the term Hinduism is too vague to be properly defined, and that there is hardly anything substantially common which binds one Hindu to another in the ties of national brotherhood. Hinduism, in short, is said to be more of congeries of different religious sects holding diverse and not unoften diametrically opposite views on matters of faith and doctrine. Hinduism is said to include and cover almost every form of religious faith known to or practised by mankind, from the purest monotheism, to the lowest form of animism, polytheism, henotheism, pantheism, in fact all sorts of *isms*. There is a fairly large class of Hindus who suffer from want of faith in the potentialities of their religion to unite them or to inspire them to the lofty ideals of a great religious platform whereupon to bring together a Hindu union. To many the idea of a Hiudu union seems to be nothing more than an unrealizable dream. In their opinion, the talk of a Hindu nationality is a senseless talk, and the attempt to bring about a union amongst Hindus on the basis of religion is extremely impracticable. Some even go further and opine that the religious difficulties of the Hindus cannot be met with, removed or solved by an appeal to Shastras, and that amongst Hindus religious reform, too, must proceed on lines and ideas borrowed from the West. We confess we are unable to subscribe to these views, and

Reproduced from *Lajpat Rai The Man in His Word*, Madras, 1907.

are rather inclined to hold just the otherwise. We have substantial reasons to maintain that Hinduism is at least as much a religious nationality as its sister faiths, Christianity or Islam. These two latter contain as many varieties and shades of religious beliefs and doctrines in themselves, if not more, as Hinduism does, of course giving due consideration to the ages of these three religions. If Hindus have got their Vedantists, the Muhammadans have their Sufis and the Christians have those who have raised the banner of higher Christianity. If Hindus have their Trinity in Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, the Christians have theirs in Father, Son and Holy Ghost. If the Hindus have got their *Avataras*, the Christians have (besides the great incarnation of God in the body of Christ) their Popes and saints. If the Hindus believe in different deities, there are Muhammadans and Christians who believe in saints, *Walis*, *Mahdis*, &c., &c., If the Hindus have their sacrifices, the Muhammadans and Christians have theirs also. If there are Hindus who are steeped in superstitious beliefs and observe many gross forms of worship, there are millions and millions of Muhammadans and Christians also, particularly the latter, whose religious practices are as gross as those of the multitude of Hindus. If there are fables in the Puranas, there are equally ridiculous stories in the Quran and the Bible. What is, then, that deprives Hinduism of that binding force which knits together the different discordant elements in Islam and Christianity? What are the special features of the latter that are absent in the former? Is Hinduism entirely devoid of any basal principles on which the foundations of a church national could be laid? It is these latter that we, at first propose to take in hand and examine touching upon the former whenever it is relevant to do so. Our first contention is, that, like the general mass of Muhammadans and Christians, the Hindus, likewise, directly or indirectly profess to accept the Vedas as their religious scripture. The great bulk of the latter like the great bulk of the former, believe that their scriptures are the word of God, and are infallible. There are learned Muhammadans and Christians who cannot go so far and do not believe that the Quran and the Bible are the word of God. On the question of the exact authority of the scriptures in these great religions of the world there are as many schools and shades of thought with all their varieties and niceties in one as in the other. There are scoffers, agnostics and sceptics everywhere. Everywhere there are

men who do not care a jot for the scripture, make no secret of their views, but still cling to the outer form of the religion, the very essence of which they take pleasure in decrying. The number of such Christians is legion who do not believe that Christ was the son of God or the son of the Virgin, or that the Bible is the revealed word of God, but who do not still care to go out of the pale of outward Christianity. For the purposes of baptism, marriage, etc., they are as much Christians as those who believe that every letter of the Bible was spoken by God Himself.

We have said all this not with the intention of disparaging either Islam or Christianity but only in support of our contention that in these respects the religious difficulties of the Hindus are in no way greater in extent, or larger in volume, than those of their fellow subjects, the Muhammadans and the Christians. We know there are some people who are so hopeless of Hindu unity, or who are so much perplexed with the endless variety of religious belief in Hinduism, that in moments of despondency they have been heard to apostrophize if it would not be better for India if all Hindus were to accept Christianity, but irrespective of spiritual efficiency or inefficiency of Christianity, we are afraid even from the unity point of view we will not thereby be nearer the desired millennium. That such is the opinion of all impartial and disinterested observers will be amply borne out by the following quotations which we cull from a paper written by the late Professor Theodore Goldstucker on the "Religious Difficulties of India." In the paper under reference were noticed certain (then) recent publications* by two learned Hindu converts to Christianity criticising Hindu religion and philosophy and exhorting their late co-religionists to solve their religious problem by embracing Christianity.

After giving copious extracts from these publications containing the views of these learned Padries on the inconsistencies and anomalies of Hindu religion and Hindu philosophy, with his own

*1. *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy comprising the Niyoya, Sankhya and the Vedanta to which is added a discussion on the authority of the Veda by* K.M. Bannerjee of Bishop College, Calcutta.

2. *A Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems* by Nilkanth Shastri Gore.

comments thereupon, the learned Professor says: "There is another serious perplexity into which our learned authors must be aware that they will throw even those Hindus who may be clever enough to overcome all these difficulties, but it has as little been removed by them as indeed any difficulty which besets the solution of the religious problem in India. Their object as we have seen, is to persuade their countrymen to embrace the Christian religion, but they have neither explained to them what the Christian religion is, nor where it may be found. Any Hindu, who follows the deductions of Mr. Bannerjee, would simply infer that there is but one Christian religion, which a devout student of the Bible might easily acquire from a perusal of the sacred book. Let him descend, however, from the region of abstraction into that of reality, and he will soon discover the endless variety of opinions which may be founded on the apparently so intelligible scriptural text, and he will soon learn that, so far from this being a mere possibility, hundreds of creeds have sprung from this same scriptural soil, every one of which claims to be in exclusive possession of Christianity. And if he be disposed to investigate historically the mutual relation of all these creeds he will find that their difference is so essential that it was strong enough to perpetuate the most inveterate animosities and to result in wars the like of which cannot be traced in the history of any other creed.

"We have no desire to enlarge upon this theme, for we have said enough to explain why we hold the solution proposed by Mr. Bannerjee to be an impossibilty. Attempts of conversion are too frequently made without examining the limits within which they are possible and the result in which their momentary success may end. If a man derives his religious views from his own individual information or from sources which are void of authoritative influence, he may yield them to the views which are of a higher range without causing injury to the nobler part of himself. But if the creed of an individual is founded on texts held sacred and authoritative, it is a national creed; no individual can abandon it without severing himself from the national stem; no nation can surrender it without laying the axe to its own root. For religion based on texts believed sacred, embodies the whole history of the nation which professes it; it is the shortest abbreviation of all that ennobles nation's mind, is most

dear to its memory and most essential to its life No religion has better illustrated this truth than the religion founded on the Bible. It could, and was successfully, introduced amongst all nations which possess no texts supposed to be divinely inspired, and therefore of general authority, and whenever a nation possessing merely the semblance of such a text, adopted it, it thereby decreed its own end. The Romans and Greeks, when becoming Christians, ceased to be the continuation of the classical Romans and Greeks, in history, in literature, in character. Their political importance based on the conditions of the past, was brought to a close, and they had to grow into another nationality. The conditions under which this religion introduced itself into the countries of Europe was always the absence of a book ascribed to divine authorship. When Mr. Bannerjee speaks of the Jews, he has chosen an exact counter instance which goes far to prove that even a people without land, without any history which can be called their own, that a people exposed to all the horrors of persecution and all the allurements of seduction did not and does not espouse that very religion which exercises the most powerful influence on its actual destinies and which it even supports and favours amongst those who profess it. The Jews do not become Christians, simply because they believe that their Testament is a sacred book."

Having expressed these views as to the undesirability and impossibility of converting Hindus to Christianity, Professor Goldstucker further addresses the Hindus themselves, and lays down what, in his opinion, is the true key to the solution of their religious difficulty. We cannot do better than once more quote his words which are full of significance and pregnant with great meaning to all educated Hindus:

"We have been carried, however, with these remarks to the point where we cannot shrink from expressing the views which we entertain of the duties of the Brahmanical Hindus of our own days. We need not emphasise more than we have already done, that we reject as unwise and unpractical any attempt to persuade them to become Christians or to adopt the Biblical scriptures as their spiritual code. We want them to become a nation worthy of their ancestors and worthy of the great role, which in ancient times they have acted in the history of the human race, and we are satisfied

that they cannot regain that position by breaking the spring ties of their life and by exchanging their own religious uncertainty for that of any other creed. It is necssary, however, that they should realise the condition in which they are. We need not prove to them that the minds of the enlightened portion of their nation are estranged from the sectarian worship as it is practised now, but who could satisfy them that they are utterly remiss in examining where the root of the evil lies. Every Brahmanical believer, if asked, will tell that the mode of his worship is founded on the Vedas. He refers us, it is true, occasionally to the Puranas and Tantras, but he himself admits that these works have no authoritative powers unless they can prove that the tenets they contain are drawn from the Vedic source. The pivot, then, on which all religious questions of India turn, is and remains—the Veda. Philosophers and non-Philosophers, Vishnuits and Sivaits, all echo the word Veda;... ....."

Forty years have elapsed since these words were written by one of the profoundest Sanskrit scholars and one of the most competent and shrewd students of comparative religions, which Europe produced, but the words hold as good, as true and as forcible today as they were ever. In fact, the events of these forty years have, instead of showing any flaw either in the arguments or in the sentiments of the learned Professor, proved, if any further proof was needed, how accurately did he grasp the real situation and how truly did he lay down the solution.

We repeat, therefore, before we close for the present that the pivot on which all religious questions of Hindu India turn is, and remains—the Veda. To the Veda, therefore, we must go for light and guidance in our religious troubles, and in the Veda we shall find our solace.

4. A STUDY OF HINDU NATIONALISM

I HAVE read with considerable interest the article by a "Hindu Nationalist," on the Creation of a Hindu Nationality, in the June number of the *Samachar*, as also the contribution on the same subject, in the last number of this Journal, by my friend Pandit Madho Ram. While I heartily join in the "Hindu Nationalist's" appeal to the educated Hindus, yet I do not share his opinion that "the idea of Nationality is an essentially European and modern idea," nor can I agree with his reading of the facts of history relied upon by him in support of his assertion. In my humble opinion the ideas of "nationality" and "patriotism" are as old as the different countries into which the earth s divided, as ancient as the distinctions of race and religion that have been existing in this world from times immemorial and pre-historic. They may have been more phenomenal in one epoch than in another. Their hold on different races and nations may have varied in intensity or extent, but that the ideas have always been there, as fixed and immutable as those of truth and falsehood, is my firm belief. It is not, however, my intention to enter into a speculative or an historical controversy with the "Hindu Nationalist" on the origin of the sentiments of nationality and patriotism. Suffice it to say that I agree with most of his conclusions and am prepared to generally endorse the remedies suggested. In fact some of the thoughts expressed in his article were, as if, foreshadowed by me in my article on the Congress published in the *Samachar* for October 1901. This reference has been made not to suggest any borrowing on the part of the "Hindu

Originally published in the *Hindustan Review and [Kayastha Samachar*, September-October, 1902. (Vol. VI, nos. 3-4) pp. 249-54.

Nationalist," but to show that these thoughts are just now uppermost in the minds of all such Hindus as claim to love their people and to think of the means of their progress.

The "Nationalist" begins by bemoaning the absence of the idea of nationality amongst Hindus, and ascribes all our misfortunes past and present to the same fact. "The Hindus," he says, "offer a curious instance of a people without any feeling of nationality." Having thus laid down the proposition he appeals to the pages of history to support his conclusion and apparently seems to have made out a strong case. But he has evidently missed the fact that his own proposition assumes the existence of a people having a common name, who have made history by that name. Quite unconsciously he assumes the existence of a Hindu nationality when he talks of the unsuccessful efforts of the Rajputs and the Mahrattas to throw off the foreign yoke and to found a Hindu empire. What he complains of is that these efforts were spasmodic, not supported by the general body of the people and therefore not quite national, but all the time he admits by implication that there was a nation which could and should have made a combined effort. Otherwise what can he possibly mean by saying that "the Mahrattas were left to fight the last battle of the Hindus alone, unaided by the Sesodia or the Rathore?" He admits that "if allowed to grow unchecked the Mahratta confederacy might have developed into a national empire." In the face of these facts we cannot deny the existence of a nation simply because all the members of that nation did not join in the struggle for defence, or that some of them seceded or proved traitors, or joined the enemy's camp. Nor can we deny the existence of the sentiment of nationality, because that sentiment was not sufficiently strong and marked to overcome all differences among the different members of that nation, to enable them to stand as one man in defence of national interests. In the next place, why ignore the united front presented by the Hindus of all classes to repel the fourth invasion of Mahmud of Ghazni, and why forget the empires of the Pandavas, of Asoka, of Siladittya, Vikram, Bhoja, and others? Even the ill-fated Prithvi Raj, the last of the Hindu Emperors, who paid the penalty of the empire in the battle of Thaneswar, could twice command the united services of almost the whole nation in his noble and valiant defence of the empire and the fatherland. Who knows that but

for the treachery of that fratricide of a Jai Chand, history would have been made otherwise? But the treachery of Jai Chand and the defeat of Prithvi Raj do not detract from the character of the heroic stand which the nation made against the foreigner. Victories and defeats are not solely made by man but are regulated by many a cause some of which may be quite outside the control of the parties at war. If in 1193 providence decreed the fall of the Hindus, that alone is not sufficient to justify us in damning the Hindus of that period as men who were totally bereft of the sentiment of nationality. Then, as I have already hinted, the very fact of our people being known to other peoples by a distinctive name, is a proof of the existence of Hindu nationality.

I am too old now to continue to believe that the name Hindu was for the first time given to us as one involving abuse, contempt and reproach by our Mohammedan invaders. Rather, I believe that our fall and degradation helped the fall of the word also, and perhaps a peep into the philological history of the word might prove that all the bad meanings that are now assigned to the word in the Persian lexicon were of a comparatively later origin, and an outcome of the fall of the Hindu nation. Long before the Mohammedan invasion, and perhaps long before the advent of the Prophet of Islam, we were known to the people of other countries as Hindus. If so, what did this name signify? Was it a tribal distinction? I say, no, because the Hindus were of many tribes. Was it a racial name? I again say, no, because the Persians of Iran too, belonged to the same race. Was it then a religious designation? Yes, partly religious no doubt, but mainly national, and in evidence I can produce a number of quotations from the productions of early Greek historians and Mohammedan writers. For example, in what other sense does the Homer of Persia, the gifted Firdousi, who has immortalised the struggle for supremacy between the Iranians and the Turanians, use the expression Hindu in the following verses, which I pick at random from his great work, the *Shahnama.**

Then we find many references to our people as Hindus in the sacred books of the Parsis, the *Vendidad* and others. So far as the name

*The verses are in Persian and have not been reproduced here.

is concerned, our only difficulty arises when we fail to find any trace of it in our own literature where our people are invariably styled as Aryas. But here again we find enough traces of the sentiment of nationality in the passages in which the Rishis ordained all Aryas to combine against the attacks of *Dasyus*, *Chandalas* and *Mlechhas*. Gods are often invoked for protection against the latter. As for indications of an imperial spirit amongst the Hindus, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* are full of evidences of the same. What was King Yudhishthra's *Rajsuya Yajna* and by what name would you style the ambitious scheme of Jarasindhu?

The fact is that the best and the most glorious period of Aryan supremacy is yet a closed chapter to us. Almost the whole of the pre-Buddhistic period is shrouded in mystery. Even the literature that has reached us is so full of allusions, enigmas, signs, and names and is written in such an archaic language that the whole thing seems to be a mystery. According to the best of European authorities, the language of the Vedas is so full of obsolete and archaic forms and expressions that the whole seems to be a cipher which with the best of efforts might yet take years to decipher. Still we know and understand enough to be proud of, and to glory in the heritage which has descended to us from our "barbarian" (?) ancestors in the shape of national literature. And this must be the fulcrum of the lever with which we are to rise as a nation. It will not do to be unjust to our forefathers and to deny the idea of national love in them. No, they were patriots according to the best of their own light. The history of our country, from the standpoint of a Hindu, has yet to be written and till that is done, let us suspend judgement, remembering that the men whom we desire to judge and whom we are sometimes inclined to hastily condemn (often unheard) were master minds, whose productions and teachings are the loftiest in the whole range of written or known thoughts. We the English educated Hindus of the present day, who claim to have imbibed the new spirit of nationality and patriotism from the West would really do well to study a few chapters of the Vedic literature with care and thought, and I am confident that this study will open a panorama of new ideas to our view. Such a study will, I am sure, enable us to see that the key-note of the pre-Buddhistic Vedic religion was the sacrifice of all for all. True, that the genius of a jealous and perverted, sometimes corrupt and selfish, priesthood

built such a vast and stupendous superstructure of conventionalities and formalities, with an almost interminable labyrinth of rituals and ceremonials obscured by which the true spirit of the religion was practically lost and could no longer be the stay of the nation.

It is this submergence of the true spirit of the ancient Hindu faith under the load of conventional rituals and formal ceremonials, that has since been the bane of the Hindus and not the entire absence of the idea of nationality. But you might say, that we have been producing martyrs and no one can be a martyr except by the strength of faith. How can a nation destitute of faith produce martyrs ? Is there a nation who have shown more of faith in their religion, in their individuality, in their sacred laws than the Hindus? How can you otherwise explain their tenacity in clinging to their forms of religion, their pertinacity to stick to their customs? I purposely say forms of religion beacuse real religion, the religion that guides and moulds a man, or a nation, and that elevates and ennobles them, that raises them to high ideals, that evokes the highest of sacrifices, has long ago disappeared from us. In fact it was never in the post-Buddhistic period restored to its altar in the temple of hearts. True, martyrs we have certainly been producing, ever and anon, and sometimes in numbers, but when I accuse the Hindus of want of faith, I do not mean individual faith, but that social faith which is the parent of victory; the faith that arouses the multitudes; faith in their own destiny, in their own mission and in the mission of the epoch; the faith that leads on to struggle; the faith that enlightens and bids men advance fearlessly in the ways of God and Humanity, with their religion in their heart and their future progress as their goal. It is such a faith that we have been wanting since the time of Buddha and it is such a faith that we require to become a nation again.

I shall now discuss the observations of Mr. Madho Ram and I shall remark at the outset that even admitting for argument's sake the absolute accuracy of all his statements and facts, and also the correctness of the inferences he draws therefrom I would beg to differ from him in a matter of principle. My esteemed friend seems to think that all these internecine quarrels, strifes and sectarian struggles which he records at such great length in the course of his article largely take away "the chance for the progress of Hindu

Nationalism in our country," or to be more accurate in quoting his words, he questions the Hindu Nationalist, if in the face of circumstances stated by him "there is much chance for the progress of Hindu Nationalism in our country." I answer the question in the affirmative. What I am anxious to point out is, that the existence of these quarrels and strifes is neither a bar to the progress of Hindu Nationalism nor is it sufficient proof of the absence of the idea of Nationality amongst the Hindus. And this, for the simple reason that the idea of nationality does not necessarily imply a complete union amongst all its members on all matters, social, religious or political; nor does it suggest the existence of a state of perfect concord and harmony among its members or leaders, or the freedom of the latter from all human weaknesses such as to personalities or indulgences in strong or even abusive language amongst, and towards each other. Has there been any nation in the past, or is there any nation now living, which has been or is free from these differences or quarrels? Surely, Roman, Grecian, and Mohammedan histories must be admitted to present splendid and noble types of nationality and nationalism, and the present times cannot furnish better and nobler types of nationality than the English, the German, and the American and the French, not to speak of others equally noble though not so influential and powerful, such as the Swiss, the Italian, and the Dutch. Religious and social differences have played a prominent part in the histories of these nations and even now they are not free from the same. A mere glance at the English and Irish papers, a perusal of the speeches in Parliament and out of Parliament by political men, a study of the literature of different religious sects in the West and a perusal of the biographies of the public men in these countries, will show that the incidents narrated by my friend, altogether lose in significance and weight in the presence of the more vituperative and sometimes highly abusive differences and quarrels of these magnates of the European world. The truth is that honest differences, controversial discussions, and criticisms of public men by public men, are absolutely necessary for the healthy growth and progress of nationality. Then we must be prepared to meet with human weaknesses, partialities, jealousies, personalities, insinuations, innuendos, use of strong language etc., in these discussions, and controversies. Carried beyond a certain degree and limit, they might retard the

growth of nationalism, or might bring down an already completed edifice of nationality. I am not, however, prepared to admit that the differences and the disputes amongst the different classes of educated Hindus at the present moment exceed that limit. It is wrong to suppose that the idea of nationalism or nationality requires a complete union in all details of religious, social, economical, or political life or that it requires a complete freedom from sectarian quarrels or disputes or jealousies. To expect so is to expect what is an impossibility and what entirely ignores human nature. In my humble opinion it is sufficient for the growth of nationality if the different parts that claim the shelter of its way have a sense of unity, which is sufficient to make them combine against a common enemy and a common danger. Run on a few basal principles in religion, on the community of a sacred language, and on the community of interests, the Hindus ought to foster the growth of a national sentiment which should be sufficiently strong to enable them to work for the common good in the different ways and according to the lights vouchsafed to each. Let us keep one ideal before us. Let our ideal be sufficiently high to cover all, sufficiently broad and extensive to include all, who take pride in one common name, a common ancestry, a common history, a common religion, a common language and a common future.

We will not advance the cause of nationality by one inch if we decide to preserve an attitude of silent quietude and non-disturbing peace in all matters, religious and social. Such an attitude can only mean stagnation and gradual extinction. Struggle, hard struggle, is the law of progress. Yes struggle we must, both *inter se* as well others. There must be a struggle between truth and untruth, between vice and virtue, between honesty and dishonesty, between expediency and righteousness, between indolence and energy, between enterprise and a spirit of lethargy and between time-seeing selfishness and noble disinterestedness. Without this struggle no nation can ever aspire to be great and influential. This struggle we have just entered upon. We have just emerged out of stagnation, and it is no wonder that we are sometimes apt to exceed the limits of propriety or to irresistibly throw in more of sectarianism and personality, where more or much less is needed. But national delinquencies or faults are not made up or remedied in a day. Let us not be impatient of what in

my humble opinion seems to be a healthy sign of growth. Let us not strangle it by drawing its undesirable concomitants in high colours or by attaching undue importance to the same. Then there are men and men in all public bodies, religious and social. Because there are some violent men, some bad tempered, some dishonest men, some traitors and time-servers in our public associations, it is no reason to record a wholesale condemnation of the same or to be disappointed with them. Public opinion in this country has yet to grow. It is a very feeble plant yet. Its growth must cause some unpleasant friction and struggle. Let us not be impatient of it. The country has yet to foster a bold spirit of disinterested, fearless criticism. Few people in this country are guided by purely public interests. Fewer still are those who can be moved to take interest in things which do not concern them exclusively and in which they have little at stake. The interests of others do not move them. What little criticism exists in the country, is at once dubbed as sectarian, as interested, or as the outcome of jealousy or personal animosity. This criticism, that potent weapon, which alone can effectually check the vicious or selfish endencies of great and powerful men, is discouraged and strangled. What we should aim at is not the silencing of criticism but the purging it out of personalities, jealousies, abuse and vituperation. This will take time, but so long as this is not achieved, let us not discouragé, run down and do away with criticism altogether. At any rate, in my humble opinion impatience at, or silencing of mutual criticism, or absence of all controversy will not necessarily mean unity, or a healthy progress of nationalism. Having thus disposed to the best of my power the objections of the "Hindu Nationalist" based—to my mind—on a wrong view of our ancient history, and that of Pandit Madho Ram who has, in my opinion. drawn erroneous inferences from the facts detailed by him and the accuracy of which I have assumed for the sake of argument, I conclude this article with a hope that I may be able to return to the subject in a later issue and discuss the present condition and prospects of Hindu Nationalism, the evidence of its progress and the chances of its future growth.

5. REFORM OR REVIVAL?

WE THOUGHT that with the fall of the old class of Pandits we had done with those wars of words which were formerly carried on with all the weight of great learning and accompanied by a demonstrative show of deep erudition, but we had evidently counted without our hosts, the great body of Indian reformers that are the products of English education, who owe nothing to the old school of Pandits and for whom the old school of Pandits have incurred no responsibility whatever. Before the spread of English education in this county there were only two classes of public literary or intellectual entertainments to which the people were treated now and then and which supplied some diversion from the otherwise dull, monotonous or in some places extremely hazardous lives which they generally led. The one was the most popular and useful practice of reciting the *kathas* to mixed and general audience consisting of all classes of people from old men to boys and from old ladies to young girls. The ancient epics of the land—the chronicles of the life of Rama and his consort, and the great *Mahabharta*—were very often the books that were thus recited.

These *kathas* were greatly instrumental in keeping the national spark alive through so many vicissitudes of national fortune, when on occasions it had almost reached the point of total extinction. The second were the periodical religious discussions, which in most instances originated with the advent of a learned Pandit from the outside.

Very often the new Pandit's discourse had caught the popular ears and the local Pandit or Pandits thought their dignity, prestige and even emoluments were in danger, to prevent which calamity

Originally published in the *Hindustan Review and Kayastha Samachar Volume* X (1904,) pp 474-82.

they considered it their duty to come out and give a challenge to the newly arrived, to prove his superiority in the knowledge of the *shastras* by an open discussion. Or it might be that the new-comer thought his success depended on drawing out the local theologian and giving him a defeat. Be it as it may, the invariable result was that the discussion began with words, the accuracy of certain expressions used by one or the other, the applicability or the non-applicability of certain rules of grammar and ended often if not always in words and sometimes in blows. I am sorry to observe that the present quarrel over "reform or revival" between the reformers seems to me to resemble, at least in parts, the above mentioned wordy polemics between the Pandits. The reformers claim to be the leaders of the community. They have occupied the place of the Pandits and divines of former times. They profess to lay down rules for the guidance of the general mass of people. They are agreed that the state of Hindu society is bad and rotten, that it needs great and radical changes and that without these changes the whole social fabric stands in danger of giving way and burying the nation down in its debris. They have remedies, ready, patent and infallible. On most of these they agree, only to differ on the name by which the same is to be styled. Their agreement as to the remedy disappears in their differences about the wordy habitat to be given to the proposed and contemplated changes. One class of people who have already established a name for themselves do not like to give up the name they have patented and by which they have gained distinction. These latter gentlemen call themselves reformers and insist upon certain social changes being introduced in the name of "reform" and reform only. The other class who have lately come into prominence call themselves "revivalists', and they swear that any change in the social customs and institutions of the community can only be introduced under the shadow of revival. They think they cannot tolerate reform. The result is that while the former taunt the latter as "revivalists and reactionaries" the latter mock the former as "reformers and revolutionists". Both classes contain amongst them great and good men, men with pure motives and noble intentions. They are generally prominent men—well read and deep in the lore of history. Both classes are to all appearances sincere in their convictions and efforts, but to the great misfortune of the country and the nation they cannot

join their heads and work amicably. The wordy weapons are sometimes changed, and while the reformers take their stand on "reform on rational lines" the revivalists plead for "reform on national lines.' Here for once at least they seem to agree on reform, as the force of the difference is centred on the words "rational" and "national". The result is that much ink and paper are uselessly spent in dilating upon the necessary soundness of reform and the danger and risk of revival, and *vice versa*. Unfortunately no one ever sees and deplores the great waste of valuable time and precious energy which this quarrel involves—time and energy which could be usefully employed in, nay, which is imperatively demanded by so many other things that are the *sine qua non* of national progress and that should be done but are not done from want of working hands. On both sides are arrayed tough warriors armed with the knowledge and experience which is gathered by deep study and growing years. On both sides are arrayed sturdy and stout soldiers possessed of and carried by the enthusiasm of youth, full of ambition, and proud of credentials gained by academical successes and literary achievements. On both sides the pen and the tongue are being used with strength and vigour not totally devoid of grace. It is very perilous to come between such daring, bold and determined fighters specially for a comparatively ill-provided and poorly circumstanced man like myself who can wield neither the pen with the dexterity that comes of practice, nor the tongue with that skill which is the outcome of discipline. In fact I am rather inclined to think that it is positively dangerous for recruits who have not had the advantage of regular lessons in drill or of the discipline that comes out of exercises at the manoeuvres, to interfere between such veteran combatants. But the interests at stake are so great, the field is so vast, the workers in the field are so few and far between, the amount of energy available is so little and the resources are so limited, that on better thought I have decided to take the risk and raise my voice against what to me looks sheer waste of opportunities and misapplication of energy.

I will begin by examining into the respective programmes of reformers and the revivalists and see if there are any vital and real differences which justify so much contemptous talk of each other. On both sides, I believe that the social reform programme begins

and very rightly too, with the question of early marriage. I confess I am unaware of any radical difference between the views of the reformers and the revivalists on the point. In provinces other than the Punjab Mrs. Besant is believed to be the leader of the latter. Now, who does not know that she is opposed to early marriages and denounces them as unshastric and disastrous? She has in fact taken pains not only to definitely pronounce against this evil custom, but to give force to her utterances, has shut the doors of a department of her school at Benares against those who might have been or might be by the improvidence of their guardians married at a tender age. The Arya Samajists also may to a certain extent be called revivalists, but in this matter of early marriage and the marriageable ages of boys and girls they go a step further than even the most radical reformer is prepared to just now. They say and preach, and try to enforce their precept, that no girl be married under 16 and no boy under 25. Now let us ask if there is anything irrational in saying that the institution of child-marriage is not only condemnable by reason, but is actually opposed to the letter as well as the spirit of the Shastras. From the question of child-marriage we may proceed to the great evil of the present divisions and sub-divisions of caste. Mrs. Besant and her school have already pronounced against the sub-divisions in the main castes. Her defence of the original Hindu conception of four castes principally coincides with the views of the Aryasamajists in the matter and practically knocks the present caste system on the head, though in theory only. In practice neither the Arya Samajists nor the reformers can go further than denunciation. All of them agree that a beginning should be made with the sub-divisons. The sub-divisions having been swept away (which is not likely to be achieved very soon or very easily) the time will then come to think of the remoulding or the fusion of the main castes on shastric or rational lines. For the present we are all agreed that the existing arrangement is an unmixed evil, and the sooner it is done away with the better. From castes let us proceed to the question of foreign travel, and here again we find a practical unanimity. Of course, there are and there shall continue to be ultra-orthodox people who will not give up their opposition to any of these measures and will continue to say that they are un-Hindus; but just now we are not concerned with them, as

we dare say there is no one who can justly or even contemptuously be called a revivalist who condemns foreign travel on the plea of revival and no reform. Then let us take up the great question of female education. I know of no sensible man in the country, not to speak of the revivalists only, who is a man of culture and education, who is opposed to it. The school of Mrs. Besant, the Arya Samajists, and the reformers are all pledged to it. There may be and there are practical difficulties in the way of educating our girls and sisters and wives, but nobody questions the desirability, nay the necessity, of giving, if possible, the very highest education to girls. People may differ on the *modus operandi* or may have different views about schemes of education to be enforced in the case of females, but there are no two opinions on the question of principle. There may be some among the so-called revivalists who are not favourably disposed to an exact copy of European customs and usages relating to females being adopted by the Hindus, but surely there is none who can in the name of revival defend the existing Purdah system or the universal ignorance of women. Similarly we do not think there is much difference of opinion at least so far as practical measures feasible at present are concerned, on the necessity of raising the social status and bettering the condition of low castes, if Hinduism is not bent upon social indifference and mad neglect of vital interests which might result in disastrous consequences. With the exception of some apparently spurious passages in Manu and other Smritis, there is absolutely nothing in the more ancient literature to justify the inhuman and cruel treatment to which the low castes are at present or were till lately subjected. We think we have almost exhausted the list of prominent subjects comprised in the list of reforms advocated by the social reformers, having reserved one important matter to be discussed last, *viz.*, the question of widow remarriage.

On this question there exists undoubtedly real difference of opinion between the so-called reformers and the so-called revivalists. We grant that the question is a very important one; but still we are not prepared to admit that a difference on this single question justifies all that bitterness which characterises the writings of these two classes about one another. The real and important differences are on questions of religion and worship which the

social reformers profess to exclude from their curriculum of school and college education. Here in the Punjab, fortunately we have been spared that bitter fight over these words which is going on in the Western and Southern Presidencies, although we are not unaware that of late attempts have not been wanting to introduce it in collegiate and inter-collegiate debates. We cannot but deprecate these unwise attempts and will warn our young men from throwing themselves into the vortex of this absolutely unnecessary and uncalled for fight over words. We may be pardoned for pointing out that to us the fight seems to be generally on the same lines and on the same grounds which marked the polemics of the old class of Pandits. The real truth is that the so-called reformers are mostly in faith and in religion Brahmos. They were the earliest in the field and fought for reform when the revivalists had not yet come into existence. The revivalists are the products of a wider diffusion of Sanskrit literature which has taken place principally within the last quarter of a century. This study has afforded them sufficient and strong evidence of their ancestors having enjoyed a great and glorious civilization from which most of the present evil practices and customs that are the bane of modern Hinduism were absent. They, therefore, naturally look to the past for light and guidance and plead that a revival might lead them into that haven of progress which is the object of all. They have found that most of the social evils existing in their society were not to be found in the ancient Hindu race and they have, therefore, begun to appeal to the authority of the past and the Shastras for the introduction of these very reforms for which reformers had been pleading with much force though with scanty success on grounds of utility and natural justice. The revivalists are naturally popular in Hindu society as they take their stand on the authority of the Hindu Shastras and thus threaten to oust the reformers from their hard earned position. Then to add insult to injury, their exposition of the popular religious beliefs of the Hindus is so injurious and cunning as to justify a reasonable fear in the minds of the reformers that they are taking the nation back to superstitions and low and debased forms of worship from which English education, contact with Western religion, and a study of the masterminds of the West was just extricating them with so desirable a success. The reformers had thus based their religious propaganda on the

same basis on which their social programme rested, *viz.*, grounds of rationality. The revivalists having taken to the defence of the socalled national, have extended the same base to the removal of social evils and thus the fight began between "reform on national lines" and "reform on rational lines." But, as I have pointed out above, so far as real social reform is considered, both lines of work lead to a common conclusion. It is not, therefore, fair to entangle social reform in this quarrel which is really based on differences in religious views. Let the 'reformers' by all means if they like, ridicule the religious views of "the revivalists"; and criticise or hold them to derision, but it is not, to say the least, graceful and fair to talk of them contemptuously in matters of social reform. The same should we say to the revivalists. Happily here in the Punjab, as we have already said, there is not much difference between reform and revival. By far the strongest reforming agency in the Punjab appears to accept both. To them reform is revival and revival is reform. It is true they attach much importance to nationality or to national lines, but subject to the important proviso *that they are not irrational.* The Arya-samajists shall have nothing *irrational* though it may even have the look of being national. They want everything national which is rational as well. They even go in for things national if only they not irrational; but no further. According to them nothing can be either national or rational which is against the letter or the spirit of the Vedas. So far there seems to be no danger of the Punjab being involved in this meaningless distinction between reform and revival, but we think it is better to take time by the forelock and sound this note of warning to guard against any contemplated or impending mischief. But over and above that, it is our earnest request to the leaders of the Hindu community in the Western and the Southern provinces to abjure this absurd distinction and to work harmoniously for social reform, at least so far as all are agreed upon. Lately I had occasion to listen to an address on social progress by an esteemed friend of mine who is a pronounced social reformer. In the course of his remarks he treated the revivalists with scant respect and in support of his views read the following quotation from the Amraoti speech of that great reformer—the late Mr. Justice Ranade[1] :

"On the other side, some of our orthodox friends find fault with us, not because of the particular reforms we have in view, but on

account of the methods we follow. While the new religious sects condemn us for being too orthodox, the extreme orthodox section denounce us for being too revolutionary in our methods. According to these last, our efforts should be directed to revive and not to reform. I have many friends in this camp of extreme orthodoxy and their watchword is that revival and not reform should be our motto. They advocate a return to the old ways, and appeal to the old authorities and the old sanctions. Here also, as in the instance quoted above, people speak without realising the full significance of their own words. When we are asked to revive our institutions and customs, people seem to be very much at sea as to what it is they seem to revive. What particular period of our history is to be taken as the old ? Whether the period of the Vedas, of the Smritis, of the Puranas, or of the Mahomedan or modern Hindu times? Our usages have been changed from time to time by a slow process of growth, and, in some cases, of decay and corruption, and we cannot stop at a particular period without breaking the continuity of the whole. When my revivalist friend presses his argument upon me, he has to seek recourse in some subterfuge which really furnishes no reply to the question. What shall we revive? Shall we revive the old habits of our people when the most sacred of our caste indulged in all the abominations, as we now understand them, of animal food and drink which exhausted every section of our country's zoology and botany? The men and gods of those old days ate and drank forbidden things to excess in a way no revivalist will now venture to recommend. Shall we revive the twelve forms or sons, or eight forms of marriage which included capture, and recognised mixed and illegitimate intercourse ? Shall we revive the Niyoga system of procreating sons on our brothers' wives when widowed ? Shall we revive the old liberties taken by the Rishis and by the wives of the Rishis with the marital tie ? Shall we revive the hecatombs of animals sacrificed from year's end to year's end, and in which human beings were not spared as propitiatory offerings ? Shall we revive the *shakti* worship of the left hand with its indecencies and practical debaucheries ? Shall we revive the *sati* and infanticide customs, or the flinging of living men into the rivers, or over rocks, or hook-swinging, or the crushing beneath Jagannath car? Shall we revive the internecine wars of the Brahmans and Kshatriyas or the

cruel persecution and degradation of the aboriginal population? Shall we revive the custom of many husbands to one wife or of many wives to one husband? Shall we require our Brahmans to cease to be landlords and gentlemen, and turn into beggars and dependants upon the king as in olden times? These instances will suffice to show that the plan of reviving the ancient usages and customs will not work out salvation, and is not practicable. If these usages were good and beneficial, why were they altered by our wise ancestors? If they were bad and injurious, how can any claim be put forward for their restoration after so many ages? Besides, it seems to be forgotten that in a living organism as society is, no revival is possible. The dead and the buried or burnt are dead, buried, and burnt once for all, and the dead past cannot, therefore, be revived except by a reformation of the old materials into new organised beings."

Now, if it be permissible for a comparatively young and inexperienced man without laying himself open to a charge of disrespect for one of our revered leaders whose great wisdom, deep learning, and general judicial-mindedness are accepted all around, I will, with due deference to the late Mr. Ranade, beg to point out the injustice of the observations quoted above. Cannot a revivalist, arguing in the same strain, ask the reformers into what they wish to reform us? Whether they want us to be reformed on the pattern of the English or the French? Whether they want us to accept the divorce laws of Christian society or the temporary marriages that are now so much in favour in France or America? Whether they want to make men of our women by putting them into those avocations for which nature never meant them? Whether they want us to substitute the legal *niyoga* of the Mahabharata period with the illegal and immoral *niyoga* that is nowadays rampant in European society? Whether they want us to reform into Sunday drinkers of brandy and promiscuous eaters of beef? In short, whether they want to revolutionise our society by an outlandish imitation of European customs and manners and an undiminished adoption of European vice? The revivalists do not admit that the institutions which they want to revive are dead, burnt and gone. The very fact that they wish to revive them goes to show that they believe that there is still some life left in them and that given the proper remedy, their present unhealthy and abnormal state

is sure to disappear and result in the bringing about of the normal and healthy condition of affairs. In fact, in an earlier part of the same address, Mr. Ranade summed up the position of the revivalists in a few well chosen and apt words when he admitted that, "In the case of our society especially, the usages which at present prevail amongst us are admittedly not those which obtained in the most glorious periods of our history. On most of the points which are included in our programme, our own record of the past shows that there has been a decided change for the worse and it is surely within the range of practical possibilities for us to hope that we may work up our way back to a better state of things without stirring up the rancorous hostilities which religious differences have a tendency to create and foster." It is exactly this working up our way back which the revivalists aim at. No revivalist has ever pleaded for the institutions selected by Mr. Justice Ranade as the butt end of his attack against them.

The real significance of these words—"reform" and "revival", if any, seems to be in the authority or authorities from which the reformers and the revivalists respectively seek their inspiration for guidance in matters social. The former are bent on relying more upon reason and the experience of European society, while the latter are disposed to primarily look at their Shastras and the past history, and the traditions of their people and the ancient institutions of the land which were in vogue when the nation was at the zenith of its glory. On our part we here in the Punjab are prepared to take our inspiration from both these sources, though we prefer to begin with the latter and call in the assistance of the former mainly to understand and explain what is not clear and ambiguous in the latter. But so long as our conclusions are principally the same, I think the fight is not worth being continued and may be dropped for good.

6. THE ONE PRESSING NEED OF INDIA

A QUESTION has often haunted us, asleep or awake, as to why is it that notwithstanding the presence amongst us of great, vigorous and elevating religious truths, and of the very highest conception of morality, we have been a subject race, held down for so many centuries by sets of people who were neither physically nor spiritually nor even intellectually so superior to us as *a fortiori* to demand our subjection.

We do not require a Herbert Spencer to tell us that the social efficiency of a social organism as such, depends upon the sense of social responsibility amongst the members of such an organism. The greater and the intenser the sense of responsibility amongst the individual members, regarding the safety and the welfare of the whole, the greater and the stronger the efficiency of the organism.

It is precisely this sense which is wanting in us and which stands in our way as a nation. Physically we are the equals of any people on earth. Barring those high class Hindus who think their glory consists in weak constitutions, delicate limbs and womanly features or who are given to determine their position in society by the amount of fat on their body and by the amount of physical inactivity which attends their business in life, the majority of our countrymen possess fine physiques and are able to withstand any amount of hardship and struggle. Even with the little they get to satisfy their animal wants, with their coarse food, scanty clothing and ill-ventilated and excessively crowded homesteads, they produce a soldiery which ranks amongst the best in the world. Whether it be the Rajput, the Jat, the Sikh, the Gurkha, the Purbia, the Marahtta, or the Punjabi Mussa'man, the view expressed above holds equally good in the case of all. All of them have

Reproduced form *Lala Lajpat Rai*; *The Man In His Word*, (Madras,) 1907).

by turns, earned the highest praises of military experts under whom they had occasion to serve beneath the British flag. Whatever may be said of the many mistakes of head and heart by which they lost their own battles before the advent of the British, no one can question their bravery and valour. History is full of their deeds. Intellectually too, given the opportunities, the sons of India have given no occasion to shame their mother country. The Hindu civilization, the Buddhistic achievements are standing monuments o their high intellectual calibre. Under Mohammadan rule as well, when according to the celebrated Alberuni, the elite of the Hindu community sought the safety of the remotest and the farthest parts of the country to be secure from the molestation of the fanatically disposed Mohammadans, the country continued to produce intellectual giants whose names still shed luster on the country of their birth. Under the British, too, with the few opportunities that are possessed by the Indian scholar to distinguish himself, the country has produced a Bose, a Ramchandra, a Paranjpe, a Ranade and many others whose names are the common property of all Indians. Then if we look to the domain of religion we stand almost unequalled. What other country in Europe can show the equals of the unknown authors of the *Upanishads*, Buddha, and Shankracharya? From religion if we come down to the regions of philosophy, where in one country could we find such a galaxy of truth loving, honest and bolder thinkers as the immortal authors of the six *Darshanas*, and some of their commentators and elucidators? Again, glancing at the history of chivalry and noble deeds, does not the history of the Rajputs read like a romance? Why then, are we so low in the scale of nations? What is it that keeps us down and does not allow us to raise our head above the waters? We are not wanting in flexibility or adaptability. Where on earth will you find another case parallel to Hinduism? Notwithstanding twelve centuries of Islamic propaganda backed by all the forces of political ascendancy and of that moral superiority which is the anchor sheet of a virgin religion and a conquering creed; notwithstanding again of 100 years of active evangelical work done in the name of Christ by devoted missionaries, Hinduism still reigns supreme in the land and baffles all attempts made from time to time, to displace and overthrow it. How is it then, that with all the education we have received during

the one century of British rule, with frantic professions of patriotism that are the natural result of a knowledge of our degradation and helplessness, with wild cries of nationality in danger, with pathetic appeals for reforms in the administration of the country, we have so far failed to gain anything substantial in our quest after national liberty? How is it that our cries make no impression, our appeals go unheeded and our professions turn to be of no avail? While sparing no occasion or means of criticising Government measures, very often offering right and sensible criticism, with that amount of persistency which sometimes we show, we are yet powerless to obtain even the smallest measure of reform either in constitution or in administration, or even of remedial justice? While leaving the political sphere aside, how is it that even in matters of social reform which being in our hands no Government prevents us from giving effect to, we have so far failed to achieve that amount of success which Herculean efforts of men like Ram Mohun Roy, Dayanand Saraswati, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar and Mahadeva Govind Ranade deserved? The reply is the same as we have already given above. We are individually wanting in that sense of social responsibility which requires each and every member of the organism to place the interests of the community or the nation over and above those of his own. Amongst us selfishness, greed and calculation reign supreme. Most of us cannot even think of the society or the nation. But even those who can think and do profess to care for them do not care a farthing for the same, when their own individual interests seem to clash with the interests of the society. Most of us, including some of the very highly educated men, who do not fail to exhibit often an unpardonable pride in the amount of learning locked in their brains, who very readily spend hours in finding fault with the commas and semi-colons of less gifted brethren, who do not fail to parade their knowledge of the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, of the science of Huxley or of the fine poetic genius of a Shelley or a Tennyson are utterly devoid of a sense of social responsibility.

We know that men who denounced the institution of child marriage in the vehement language they could command, were at the same time conscious of the fact that they had themselves already fixed a date for the marriage of their seven years aged girl with a boy of a similarly tender age. We have known men whose professions of patriotism were often the most profuse giving a point

blank refusal to any demand of help for any national institution. We have known of great patriots rolling in wealth, possessing palatial residences, enjoying the blessing of a good fixed income, never moving their finger to reduce misery that was next door to them. We have seen great patriotic Indians passing by in a spirit of perfect indifference, when another countryman of theirs was being cruelly beaten by a European. No Indian is supposed to make any move unless such move pays or benefits him in cash or in kind in any way. If you go to a gentleman to ask him to join such and such association or to do such and such a thing, the question that he puts to you or if he has not the courage to do so openly, to himself, is what shall he gain thereby? We know that people give subscriptions, attend meetings, join Associations and Samajes and do a lot of other things that have the look of public spirit or national help but how many of them, may we ask, except when moved by religion, do so by a sense of public duty and individual responsibility for the national cause? It is very unpleasant to speak ill of one's own countrymen or to appear to be ungrateful to those estimable gentlemen who do keep public movements going but to be truthful we shall be failing in our duty if we were to pretend a belief in their patriotism. It is our firm belief that if the country could have claimed the one tenth part of that patriotism which is often paraded and assumed, the state of things would have been different and no Government could have ignored the existence or the demands of such patriotism. But the facts are otherwise; not that the social ideals taught by our religion are low and mean, not that this rank selfishness and base calculation of self interest is countenanced by the teachings of our greatmen, not that this sense of national and public duty is entirely absent from the teachings of our Shastras. No. Political degradation for so long has practically extinguished the very germs of this noble sentiment from our blood. Our immediate ancestors did not possess it, so we could not inherit it from them. As for its inculcation from without we are sorry that the advantages of Western culture have not been unmixed. While very few have imbibed its noble sentiments, a large number have taken and adopted in life its materialistic tendencies. We know that we require the latter too, rather badly, but we cannot forget that, if we once allow ourselves to be possessed of these only without the other necessary and counteracting tendencies, we are done for. The country may grow rich, it may

extend its commerce, it might even begin to manufacture for other countries; but unless all this is accompanied by a sense of public duty in the people of this country, all this will not avail us, nay, might be the very foundation of future fall, if further fall is yet possible. Yes, we want all this, but first and foremost of all we want the habit and sense of subordinating our individual interests before the interests of the community at large. In short, what we pre-eminently want is that every Indian may be sufficiently patriotic and dutiful to believe and act up to the belief that the interests of the country are paramount and must override all private considerations. We want this to be regularly taught as the highest religion that will bring about the salvation of India. To promulgate this we want faithful and true preachers who may be living examples of their propaganda and who can show the power of their faith in their own persons. Let each province produce a number of such preachers and we are convinced that patriotism will gain firm ground in the country and the cause of nationality will advance with leaps and bounds. Without this we may go on crying for decades and decades but we shall not advance an inch.

7. CONGRESS DEPUTATION TO ENGLAND

IN THANKING you for the great honour you have done me by electing me as your representative on the Congress Deputation going to England and in assembling here to bid me farewell, I think I am bound to make some observations on the political outlook in general and on the prospects of political work in Great Britain in particular. Coming straight as I am from the Kangra Valley I cannot help being very sad and dejected just now as I saw a sight there which has touched me to the core, and which has temporarily at least impressed me with the vanity of all human struggles[1]. However optimistic one may be the present is a time when no one can help being sad and melancholy at the great crisis through which this country is passing. At first sight the near future is anything but bright. Nay it is positively gloomy. A sense of overwhelming fatality prevails in the country. On all sides he finds that his country and his people are being held fast by adverse circumstances. To his limited vision even the elements seem to have joined hands with men in running down and chasing to death and destruction the ill-fated people of this once, the land of the Devas. On one side a "benevolent" Government proud of its "unparalleled liberality" is doing its level best to put back the hand of the clock of progress. On the other, the demons of disease, pestilence, scarcity and famine seem to have taken a fancy for this country of ours. Without showing any sign of mercy, they are every day tightening their grip closer and closer. While on the one side an all-powerful Government is busily and assiduously engaged in devising plans and making rules which are very likely to close the gates of secondary schools and colleges

Farewell address at a representative gathering of citizens of Lahore on May 8, 1905 on the eve of his departure for England as a member of Congress deputation. Reproduced from *The Panjabee* of 15 May 1905.

against the sons of the poor and the peasant[2], the rich and the well-to-do are being hustled into eternity by plague and earthquake. At this moment there is hardly a single class of His Majesty King Edward's Indian subjects who is happy and contented. Even the Royal Prince finds that his position, influence and power are gone and that in the land which was probably his for centuries past, acquired by his ancestors and ruled by his forefathers, he is today possessed of as much real power as a common coolie; that the place which his predecessors only a few decades ago occupied in that land of his sires, is now virtually occupied by a common agent of that foreign Government which rules supreme over the 30 crores of Indians; that his honour, rank and emoluments (reader, mark the word emoluments for Ruling Chiefs of First Class Native States such as Kashmere) are at the mercy of a foreigner whose pay is charged against his own revenues: yes, while the prince is smarting under the loss of dignity from which he suffers by the insults heaped upon him by the local embodiment of the Imperial power, the peasant is no less unhappy in his hut. Ground down by the rigid and inflexible revenue system, crushed by continuous famines, bound down by the forest laws, which prevent him from picking up wild fruit for food, bits of fuel for his hearth and the cutting of grass for his sheep, he drags his miserable lot cursing neither the Government nor his God but his own fate. Coming to the other classes you hear the same cry of woe from the landlord, the money-lender, the trader, the pleader and the Government servant. The latter who was till lately very cheerful and happy is now the loudest and the bitterest in his complaints against his employers, forced to sit till late in the evening often burning oil to perform his daily task he finds that his prospects are either gone or seriously curtailed. The number of posts carrying gold salaries which ordinarily fell to the lot of the sons of the soil, is falling; the salaries are going down while the provisions are going up in prices and necessities becoming dearer and rarer every day. But amidst all these scenes of death, disease and distracting darkness, is there no streak of light and sunshine and not a vestige of hope? I am loath to admit that such is the case. Thinking seriously of the situation I am at times inclined to adopt an attitude of thankfulness towards Lord Curzon for his having opened the eyes of the Indians to the huge delusion under which they were living and to the absolute necessity of unity of classes for the common weal,

and to the still greater necessity of never forgetting the truth of the saying that "a nation which cannot win its own freedom does not deserve it"

The unanimous protest made by the whole country against Lord Curzon's attack on our national character[3] and the one unbroken wave of indignation which the Universities Validating Act[4] has evoked, the tangible awakening to the necessity of industrial and technical education abroad and the moral conviction that our salvation must after all come from within, are to my mind some of the substantial gains which the country seems to have scored by Lord Curzon's unmasked benevolence and liberalism. In my humble opinion Lord Curzon has done a service to this country by giving them some object lessons in politics and disabusing them of certain deep-rooted wrong impressions. Although Lord Curzon too has played very freely with that fatal gift, viz., the gift of making soft and grandiloquent speeches, still his occasional slips and the results of his policy have given to people of this country sufficient and tangible evidences of the real trend of his policy. Although we can never be too grateful to those high-minded British statesmen who have now and then advanced the cause of education in this country and honestly striven to further its prosperity and hold the balance of justice even between the claims of the rulers and the ruled, still I think it is a providential dispensation to have now and then a Governor who, by a policy of retrogression, forcibly drives home the necessity of self-reliance and self-help to the minds of the subject race. Lord Curzon's policy has only laid bare the fact which can be abundantly proved by quotations from the history of British rule in India, if any proof is needed, that British rule in India exists primarily for the British and only secondarily for the sons of the soil, and that with the exception of a few high-minded and noble-souled Englishmen, the ordinary Briton is as selfish and self-centred as the ordinary run of humanity. From the necessities of the situation and from the ready proneness of the people of this country to believe in the benevolent intentions of others, often taking them at their words it is necessary that something should occasionally happen to open their eyes to the true nature of things and to enable them to see things in their real colour. Viewed from this point of view I think Lord Curzon's policy, declarations and acts may prove to be of great value to the people of this country.

One of the signs of the time is the coming to light of a greater desire of unity between the Hindus and Mohammedans. The former have always been eager for it and making substantial advances to achieve that end. But till now except in Bombay and Madras the feeling was hardly reciprocated by the Mohammedans. In Upper India, in fact, a contrary policy ruled supreme for sometime and gave birth to a policy of retaliation on the part of the Hindus. Of late, however, evidences have not been wanting of a better spirit having taken hold of our Mohammedan brethren. Both Hindus and Mohammedans in Upper India seem to be realising, slowly though, that while each of them can honestly try his best for the good of his own co-religionists, both of them can join hands while common interests are in danger, or where they can join hands without the chances of inflicting any loss on their respective communities. Some educated Mohammedans have of late begun to see eye to eye with the great body of educated Hindus on political questions of the day and this is a very healthy and welcome sign of times. Then again the promptness with which Bengal has managed to send ten of its best graduates (amongst them two Mohammedans) for education abroad and the example set by some Native States too is worthy of note. The industrial awakening, though it requires a veay careful handling and a very vigilant nursing is again very hopeful. Under the circumstances what the country now chiefly stands in need of is a determination to push on education of all sort at all costs and though not quite up to what is required, there are some slight indications of the people having formed or being prepared to form such a determination. On the whole then I think there is no ground for despondency and no occasion for giving way to hopelessness.

At this stage it might be expected of me to explain if there is much good likely to be done by the Congress deputation proceeding to England and spending Rs. 50,000 upon political agitation there. If it is true that the salvation of India depends upon education why not then spend these 50,000 in furthering the cause of education at home, rather than spend the money in a foreign country under the vain hope of extorting political concessions from the "benevolent" British voter.

Now to be frank in the matter. I have never believed in the benevolent intentions of the British electors more than I do in that

of any other man of the world. I think he is as good or as bad a man as there are others in this world. Just now Providence has placed him in a position from which he can afford to be benevolent and liberal towards those less favourably situated than he is. While thus using his opportunities for the greatest good of himself he does not grudge a little show of benevolence and liberality towards others. But to think that he is prepared to lessen his imperial grip upon you or sacrifice his rights, privileges and interests for your sake or for the matter of that for any body is counting too far, and living in a world of delusion. He is not going to do anything of the sort unless and until he is convinced that his own imperial and national interest require a change in the Government of this country or in the principles upon which the Government of this country is at present conducted. With me this has been an article of faith for long and I have no reason now to change or alter it in any way. So far as the British elector, therefore, is concerned it will do no good to appeal to him in the name of political philanthrophy or ethical justice in matters political. But then there are Englishmen who think that the misgovernment of India is a danger to the supremacy of England in India and to its position as a first class power in the world. As patriotic Englishmen it is their duty to avert such a catastrophe. Now if we honestly believe that the best interests of India for some time to come at least are bound up with the supremacy of England in India and that, for us constitutional agitation is the only safe method of ameliorating our condition, then I think it is our duty to strengthen the hands of such patriotic Englishmen and to cultivate relations of trust and friendship with them. There is no doubt that the Congress deputation will achieve this object more effectually than it could otherwise be done.

Secondly, now that steam and electricity have practically demolished all differences of space and time and have brought the whole world together it is an absolute necessity for the public men of this country to go and study on the spot the political and educational institutions of the other countries in the world and to profit by the experience of others. Then, again, the influence which the press and platform nowadays exercise not only in the countries where they exist and which they directly represent, but practically all the world over, it is to the best interests of India

that it should have supporters amongst these powerful classes in the independent and powerful countries of the world.

India and Indian public men can no longer afford to be segregated and enjoy that aloofness which they have maintained so long. If Western institutions are good and worthy of being copied in India, they must be studied on the spot by some of those Indians who have consecrated their lives to the service of their country and who are in a position to form correct opinions about the same. They must study the circumstances under which they have been brought into existence and have thrived there. They must look if those circumstances exist in their country, and if not, whether they can be brought into existence here. Or if that be impossible with what changes and modifications they can be adapted to the needs and circumstances of their country. All this they must study on the spot, which they can best do when they go to these foreign countries in a representative capacity, *i.e.*, not for sightseeing but as the accredited agents of their countrymen, because in such a case they go with a sense of national duty and obligation which every honest public man must feel the greater if he goes at the public expense. Moreover, the respect which he may command and the opportunities which may be open to him as such may be denied to him otherwise.

Such at any rate are the reasons which have swayed with me in making me agree to join the Congress Deputation as a representative of the Punjab. I do not know how far I may succeed in these aims, but one thing you may be certain of and that is that I will strive every nerve to make the best use of my stay abroad, a use which might help me in the performance of those public duties which I have taken upon myself or which I may hereafter be called upon to undertake. I may assure you that no part of the public money collected for the Deputation shall be spent on sightseeing or otherwise on objects which are not likely to further the public interests of my people. If I am conscious of the great honour you have done me in selecting me as your representative, I am no less conscious of my shortcomings to fill up that role. I wish an abler and more capable man could be found to represent you with honour and credit to himself as well as to the province which we all love so deeply. But in the absence of one such, ready to accept the responsibility, I have presumed to d so

he hope that although in no way equal in literary talents, 'acility of speech and writing, in impressive eloquence and in tion to any of my colleagues on the Deputation who represent other provinces of our country, I yield to none in the depth ny love for my country and in readiness to serve it at any cost.), gentlemen let me hope that you may have no occasion to be least ashamed of your selection.

8. LANCASHIRE AND INDIA

LET ME first thank you for the opportunity you have given me of placing my views before you regarding the relations of Lancashire with India. A strange and inscrutable Providence has brought these countries so near each other that notwithstanding a distance of thousands of miles intervening, the fortunes of one are closely allied with those of the other. While Lancashire is represented in almost every homestead in India by the goods manufactured by its people, few of the latter can go to bed without having had, in the course of the day, an occasion to think of India, either as a purchaser of their finished produce or as a supplier of the material without which a great number of Lancashire operatives might go without work.

Under the circumstances I am convinced that a better understanding on the part of Lancashire of the state of political conditions prevailing in India is sure to be useful to both. It is to be greatly regretted, gentlemen, that India which plays such an important part in the fortunes of England should receive so little attention at the hands of its politicians and statesmen. To one who even by a few days residence in this country cannot help remarking how shrewd, generally well-informed and keen businessmen, the English are, it seems quite inexplicable that there should be so much ignorance and indifference about the affairs of India which is admittedly the brightest jewel in the Crown of Great Britain. In fact, so extensive and so culpable is this ignorance that very often foreign diplomatists have been heard to be chuckling over the same in their criticisms of England and English affairs.

Address delivered by Lajpat Rai at a meeting held in the Stockport Labour Church, Lancashire, on 27 July 1905, during his tour of England as a delegate of the Indian National Congress. Reproduced from *The Panjabee* of 2I Angust 1905.

The late Mr. Henry Fawcett[1] quoting a distinguished German diplomatist and statesman remarked upon the strangeness of the fact that while the possession of India was looked upon as the greatest distinction which England had obtained and that the loss of India through misgovernment would be the greatest blow to the reputation of England and fatal to its prestige, yet so little did Englishmen at home realise the vast responsibility of the trust they had assumed that he found, that there was not so much attention given to Indian affairs and that there was not so much known of the subject in England as in Germany. Not to talk of the interest of Englishmen in general, even the Parliament is so neglectful of Indian affairs that hardly any importance is attached to the discussion of the same. Ministers and members both join hands in putting the debate on the Indian Budget to the fag end of the session and when that inevitable date does come, both vie with each other in flying from the House. Who can doubt the truth of the remark once made by Mr. Henry Fawcett that "India having no representative of its own in the House of Commons and little public opinion in her support out of doors, had to bear the disadvantages of party Government without any of its advantages. India may be neglected, her money may be wasted, her affairs may be mismanaged,it will not affect the interests of party, it will scarcely raise a ripple on the surface of politics." If so, gentlemen, I may congratulate you upon the trouble you have taken to-night of arranging this meeting and of coming over to hear the views of an Indian, regarding the government of his country by the English.

I do not know if it will be of any use discussing generally whether British rule in India has been an unmixed blessing or an unmitigated evil. You know that even on this question, as on every other in the world, there are two parties. One of them is led by that vain-glorious school of British politicians whose chief credit lies in singing the praises of their countrymen abroad, nay, often in reciting their own glories, who maintain that British rule in India has resulted in the unparalleled prosperity and the unheard of happiness of the people of India. They hold it to be a marvel of success and the greatest boon which the people of India could hope for from a merciful Providence. They are not prepared to admit any mistakes nor do they acknowledge any shortcomings or failures. I wish these gentlemen, at least for the sake of experiment, had occasion to live under a similar regime. Then there is another party who argue that

the rule of the British in India has been nothing short of a curse of God and a visitation of Providence in one of its fearful aspects. They contend that the British in India have reduced the country and its people to a state of want and destitution never before known, even in that land of fluctuating seasons and changing fortunes, and that never before in the memory of man, as strengthened and supplemented by the records of History, has India witnessed such videspread misery and universal poverty. Probably both these statements have some truth in them. Those who talk of the success of England in India base their judgment on the outward glitter of western institutions transplanted into India by the English. They look to the Railways, the Telegraph, the Schools, the Universities. the harbours and so on. Having been under the impression that never before was India in closer touch with the outside world, they think that in opening out that land of mysteries to the civilised world they have conferred the greatest boon on the people of the country.

Well, so far may be admitted and admitted gratefully that the English have to a certain extent helped the Indians to come out of that shell of superstition and ignorance in which they were at the time when the country passed into the hands of the British. They have certainly afforded us opportunities to come into touch with the other civilised parts of the globe and thus given us facilities to assimilate their civilization and culture as far as our circumstances permitted of the same being done with profit. But then they forget that civilization, without the means of enjoying the fruits of the same, is surely not worth much. Nay, it is positively injurious. A starving man cannot appreciate or bless your civilization. A little bit of education in exchange for all the commodities of the world which make life enjoyable and bearable on earth is hardly a precious possession. Indians have, therefore, no reason to be thankful to the British for having civilised them (even if that be conceded) in exchange for all the other good things of the world of which they have been deprived by the unnatural rule of the foreigner and his extremely unsound financial and economic policy. But let us stop and examine your claims regarding having civilised us. Now that the labours of your own savants and scholars have opened out the closed pages of ancient Indian history to the great delight and benefit of the whole world, they have removed the justification for that boast even. The period of Indian history which enabled the British to

assume the sovereignty of that great peninsula, was the darkest in the annals of that land and the British cannot reasonably base their exaggerated estimate of their good work in India on that foundation. It is true they have provided some schools and colleges for educating the sons of the soil but even these latter, if you look closely into the state of things, afford no ground for that display of self-glorification into which Anglo-Indians are apt to indulge. Firstly, the principles of liberal educational policy laid down by a succession of broad-minded wise statesmen like Macaulay, Canning and Ripon, are being deliberately undermined and just now a policy of reaction is in the ascendant ; secondly, what comparison can India stand in matters of education even with the least civilised countries of the West ? The institutions for imparting education are very few, the percentage of those who can read and write is extremely low and one of which every British politician ought to be ashamed.

I wonder how can the English talk with any pride of their work of spreading education in India when after a century and a quarter of their rule in some parts of India we find that more than ninety per cent. of the population of those parts is still entirely illiterate and unable to either read or write. The expenditure on public education in India stands at a figure of which no civilised Government can ever make a mention without a blush, *viz.*, about 3d. per head per annum. Then the methods of education are old and rotten, antiquated and superseded, abandoned and changed by all progressive peoples in the West. Under these circumstances, it is hardly justifiable for Englishmen to boast of the great results achieved by them in the way of civilising India. But Indians are a nation of people who are easily satisfied and they make no secret of it that they are grateful to their rulers even for such small mercies. All this gratefulness, however, vanishes away when they look around them and observe the evidences of that universal poverty which at this moment prevails in India and which on the first failure of rains reduces the whole mass of people to the verge of starvation. It is no wonder that the British rule in India has been quite a blessing. Thus you see, ladies and gentlemen, as I have already remarked, that this question of British rule in India having been a blessing or not is a very long and disputed one. It has its two sides and a great deal can be said on both sides with some show of reason. The truth, however, is that a foreign rule, however well-intentioned it may be, can never be

a blessing. Much less when it is conducted on despotic lines by autocrats invested with powers larger than even the angels could be safely trusted with. The Government of India, as at present constituted, is a Government of irresponsible foreigners, whose principal aim is the exploitation of the country and its people and who are allowed to have their own way in ruling the country without any reasonable amount of control from the great nation in whose name they rule and whom they profess to represent. It is true that by the declarations of the Sovereign, the British have pledged themselves to treat Indians as fellow subjects. It is equally true that now and then we happen to meet a statesman who tries to be loyal to these declarations and who strives to vindicate the honour of his Sovereign and redeem the pledges given by him, but then the odds against him are so many and the difficulties in his way so tremendous that at the end he finds all his efforts ending in smoke and all his good intentions resulting in nothing. In fact, sometimes you see that the policy inaugurated by a well-intentioned statesman does more harm than good, in so much as it leaves very bitter memories behind and with a bureaucracy at the helm of affairs determind to take their revenge not only reverse all that he had done, but to carry it to the other extremity.

Viceroys might come and Viceroys might go but the political conditions in India must remain hopeless of reform unless and until the system of government is so changed as to reduce the vast, unlimited and unhampered powers which the bureaucracy wields without any sense of their responsibility to the people of the country and unless and until something substantial is done to act up to the declarations of the Sovereign and make the Indians realize that they are the free citizens of a great empire. So long as there exists in India a ruling class separate and distinct from the ruled, it is futile to hope for any improvement in the condition of things in India. Man is after all man, be he of any nationality or creed or colour. That man must be an angel and something of the divine who can rise above the ordinary animal limitations of man and decline to take advantage of the superior position in which his good luck has placed him. It is not much use therefore, to discourse on the iniquities of the despotic autocrats who in the name of the British people carry on the Government of India in a bureaucratic spirit and exact the full pound of flesh to which they think they are entitled by virtue of their domination

over that country. And it is no wonder that after a century and a quarter of British rule, in some parts of India, the people of those parts find that the treatment which they meet at the hands of their rulers is anything but just and fair and far from what was likely to make them forget the humiliations incidental to the conditions of a subject race.

The distinctions of race and colour observed in the bestowal of Government patronage, the disqualifications from which the sons of the soil suffer in the struggle of life, the indignities that are often hurled at them simply by reason of their colour not being white, the persistent refusal to give them a substantial or even a reasonable share in the administration of the affairs of their own country and the patronising tone so often assumed by Anglo-Indian administrators cannot but remind them, at every step of their life, that Englishmen in India are not prepared to treat them as citizens of the Empire and that they have yet to win their position as such. In my opinion it is rather unfortunate for England as well as for India that the educated Indians all over the country should be imbued with the spirit of a fight but the circumstances under which they live and the antiquated methods by which they are governed by a despotic bureaucracy leave them no other option. The inequalities from which they suffer, the humiliations to which they are subjected, the disadvantages under which they labour, the misery of the bulk of the population, the state of destitution and poverty from which the great mass of the people suffer, the increasing insolence and impertinence of the ruling classes and the offensive intolerant bigotry and greed of the powerful bureaucracy at the helm of affairs leave no other alternative. The only redeeming feature of the situation is that they have not yet lost all faith in the fairness of the great British nation. The great bulk of the people in India still believe that the Feringee at home, as the ordinary Indian rustic calls an Englishman, is more just and open to reason than his arrogant and puffed up brother in India. Whether rightly or wrongly (it is for you gentlemen to say and to show by your deeds) every educated Indian who has read English history believes that in addition to his sound business instincts, John Bull is generally a kindly disposed person and a lover of liberty and it is not likely that he will ignore the lessons of history—of those blood-written pages of English and European history, in the writing of which he has played such a prominent part. Gentlemen, it is idle to shut your eyes and

close your ears to the dictum of history—that infallible recorder of the wisdom and folly of mankind and that never failing guide of those who have eyes to see and hearts to feel. It is not likely that Indians who have drunk deep of the fountain of history including that of modern Europe will not benefit from the lessons imparted therein. Then, again, you will have to destroy all your telegraphic and railway lines to keep any people on the face of the globe ignorant of what so often happens in the Near East and of what has now been happening in Russia and in the Far East. Under the circumstances Indians hope that the British at home may be expected to take a better, a truer and a sounder view of the relations of India and England than their representatives in India take or are likely to take. Being at such a distance from the contaminating atmosphere of a subject country, breathing the air of independence and freedom, being free from those absurd notions of false prestige and insolent dignity which so often guide or misguide the average Anglo-Indian and drive him so far away from the paths of justice and fairplay, the average Briton staying at home is believed to be more likely to take a a more business-like view of the duties which Englismen owe to India. But if that is expected of an average Englisman at home much more is expected of Lancashire and its people. The interests, the well-being and the prosperity of the latter are so much linked with India that they at least should not see the growing discontent and poverty in India with indifference. Whatever may be said of the ethics of the policy which has resulted in the crushing and dislocation of Indian industries, it cannot be denied that at this moment India is the greatest and the most paying customer of Lancashire.

Great Britain claims more than seventy per cent. of the total import trade of India and more than thirty per cent. of its exports, of which Lancashire can be credited with the best and greatest slice. The growing poverty of the Indians means so much decrease in their purchasing power. The growing disaffection of the Indians means the transference of that affection to countries other than the British. I am, therefore, inclined to maintain, gentlemen, that the prosperity and good government of India are of paramount importance to Lancashire and all classes of its great trading community, be they manufacturers, shippers, or working men. You know,

perhaps better than I do how these recurring famines, chronic and long-staying pestilences and constant frontier wars, affect and dislocate trade. Scarcity in India means calamity to Lancashire. It means a contracted supply of cotton and other raw materials and a still more contracted demand for manufactured goods, a state of things which tells heavily on both the manufacturer and the workman. Why, the problem of the British unemployment might be solved very considerably if things could be so arranged as to increase the purchasing power of the Indian masses. A bumper harvest in India means a bumper season for Lancashire. But as at present circumstanced, the average value of an Indian's trade with England is only represented by the small figure of 4s.8d. per annum which, according to the caculation of the late Mr. Digby[2] than whom a greater authority on questions like these could not be quoted, falls to under a halfpenny per head per annum in the case of 171 millions of them. If so, gentlemen, may I ask if as sound businessmen it is not your duty to see that the purchasing power of every Indian increases and that he has more to invest in the good things of this world. The Indian National Congress, that great organisation of educated Indians, points out the way how to bring about that result. It pleads for a cheaper and more representative system of government. It urges for a sounder and lighter system of taxation. It asks for extended facility and more practical methods of education. All these reforms, if effected lead to one result, *viz.*, the prosperity and the contentment of the people of India. "The great concern of the people of India" said James Mill who could hardly be accused of any partiality towards Indians "is that the business of Government should be well and cheaply performed." Well, the Indian National Congress points out how this can be achieved, *viz.*, by a larger employment of the Indian agency in the transaction of government affairs and the reducing of military expenditure. Many years ago the late Mr. Henry Fawcett when speaking from his place in the House of Commons deplored the great increase in the military expenditure of the country. With that mastery over facts and figures which he commanded he showed how India, with a much smaller revenue than England, maintained an army more costly than that of this country. But be it noted that the expenditure on the army at that time, to which he objected so vehemently, was 16 millions while in this blessed year of 1905 it has been

raised to the portentous figure of 23 millions. He had also sounded a warning to the effect that if increase of taxation was a pretty serious affair in England, it was a hundred times more serious in India. But look at what has happened.

Since then taxes after taxes have been piled and the finances of the country have been brought into a muddle. You have of late become familiar with "prosperity" Budgets but I do not know if you are aware of the artificial methods by which notwithstanding years of pestilence, plague and famine the Government has been able to put a face of prosperity. Prosperity indeed! When millions die of diseases which are directly due to under-feeding, under-clothing and unwholesome housing. I am afraid I will tire you out by details, otherwise I could conclusively establish to your satisfaction the utter unreliablity of these prosperity Budgets and the utter unsoundness of the system of government accounts as prevails in India. Many of the evils pointed out by Mr. Henry Fawcett exist in their entirety up to the present moment and account for these fictitious prosperity Budgets. The Indian National Congress pleads for an economic and cheap system of Government which means more money to be left with the people for being spent in the country. Then in the matter of the employment of Indian agency in the business of Government, there too the reform is sure to lead to the efficiency of the administration and prosperity of the people. It means the partial control of that economic drain which is just now telling so disastrously on India. India pays heavily for civil servants, judges and administrators who do not know the vernaculars of the country and are absolutely ignorant of the customs and manners of the people. So much so that some judges, highly paid civilians and barristers, display a ridiculous want of knowledge of the language of the country when failing to understand the evidence of a witness speaking his own tongue they mistake the names of animals and articles for names of human beings. What will you think of a Judge who, not knowing the vernacular equivalent of a buffalo or a donkey, will insist upon the latter being produced to give evidence. Oh! we are sick of these anomalies and I am sure you would be sick of them if you were to know of even one tenth of them. But it is difficult to remedy the existing evil unless you all wake up and take a greater and more intelligent interest

in the affairs of India. You know, gentlemen, how difficult it is to deal with vested rights. There are certain classes in this country who think they have vested rights in India. You know to your cost how difficult it is to deal with such classes, and so long as India is a convenient place to find comfortable and paying berths for the dull, indolent, luxury-loving and otherwise good-for-nothing scions of these classes, one cannot expect any appreciable reform in the system of government or in the treatment of Indians by Englishmen. Do you know, gentlemen, that the dullards of whom I have spoken above, when they fail to pass the Indian Civil Service examination by open competition, get commissions in the Indian army and from there are transferred to the Civil Service. Thus we find that in the Punjab and some other provinces a system of hereditary succession to high government offices from father to son and from son to grandson prevails. These men who are worthless otherwise and often incapable of following the commonest law point argued before them, possessed of a very thick crust which is difficult to penetrate through even with a clear statement of your case as they are, are often found working as Judges and administering law. It is this class of Anglo-Indians who are most anxious to maintain the existing *status quo* and keep out the sons of the soil from a proper share in the administration of their own country.

If your aristocrats, Ladies and Gentlemen, care precious little for the middle classes and the working men of this country, much less are they likely to care for Indians so long as the system of government there suits their purposes and meets their ends. But what may be difficult for us to achieve alone may be considerably altered by your help. It is to you, therefore, that we appeal for co-operation and support. You may excuse me for pointing out to you that the mis-government of India might be productive of more serious harm than at present you can conceive of. You know a starving man cannot properly discriminate. It will be no fault of his if he is disposed to lay the blame upon the whole British community and in a moment of despair think of desperate measures. Thank God that as yet the matters have not come to that pass but the things are so rapidly going from bad to worse that any day might arouse you from your sleep. There are some people in India who argue and argue loudly that the

best way to bring home to Lancashire and manufacturing England the state of things in India is to boycott English-made goods, not necessarily in favour of Indian goods but in favour of any goods not English. Gentlemen, it will be worth your while to study who amongst the Indian population are the largest consumers of English-made goods. A little careful observation will show that as yet most of the costly goods produced by Lancashire are consumed by the English-speaking Indians. If so, am I wrong in asking you to extend your sympathy to these English-speaking Indians and help them in their constitutional fight for political rights against the bureaucratic government of India? Assisted by you they might succeed in obtaining a better system of government for their country by which, in the words of James Mill, means of accumulation may be afforded to your Indian fellow subjects and under which they may have chances of growing rich, as cultivators, merchants and manufacturers.

A few observations more, gentlemen, and I have done. I cannot let this opportunity go without saying a word as to another impression gaining ground amongst Indians which it may be worth your while to remove. There is an impression in India that Lancashire is very jealous of Indian manufactures and is interested in keeping down Indian industries. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I have no doubt that the impression must be wrong because I cannot bring my mind to believe that shrewd, highly intelligent, and well-read in history and politics as Lancashire merchants are, they can believe in that old, rotten, antiquated fallacy of the secrets of trade. Now when the doors of knowledge have been thrown open everywhere in the world no one can, arbitrarily or out of jealousy, be kept out of that knowledge which is a *sine qua non* of industrial pursuits and manufacturing capacity. This knowledge and the facilities to acquire it are accessible to any one who has the means to pay for them in the wide, wide world, in Germany, in America, and last but not least in Japan. I cannot believe that the highly gifted class of Lancashire merchants do not realise and cannot see this. It is an insult to their intelligence and broadmindedness to think otherwise. My own idea is that it will be to the interest of both India and Lancashire to understand each other better. India can gain nothing by substituting Germany, America, or any other country for Lancashire

either for the purposes of import or export, because it must be long before India can supply its own needs. For a long, long time to come India must continue to import finished and costly goods from outside and there is no reason why it should purchase those goods from any one but England. On the other hand, it will do no harm to Lancashire if the latter were to take Indians into their confidence and qualify them to manufacture those cheap and coarse goods which it is at present importing from Germany and other countries. Such a sympathy from Lancashire will, I am sure, meet with a reciprocal good-will on the part of India in the matter of supplying raw materials. Remember, gentlemen, that it lies in the power of India to make you to a great extent independent of America in the matter of supply of cotton.

It is, therefore, my humble conviction that a better understanding and reciprocal good feeling between Lancashire and India will be to the good of both. The more prosperous, wealthier, happier, the better educated and skilled India is, the better for Lancashire. Let Lancashire then exert for the good government of India and for the removal of those anomalies and disqualifications from which Indians suffer and India will, I am sure, amply repay the kindness of Lancashire.

May we hope that on the occasion of the next General Election you will make it a point to take certain pledges from your candidates to the effect that they will take greater interest in Indian affairs and vote in favour of reform measures ?

In the end I thank you for the patience with which you have heard me.

9. OUR STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM : HOW TO CARRY IT ON

No patriotic Indian can return to his country after a trip to England, including a visit, however short, to other countries in Europe, without being forcibly struck by the intense desire for political liberty and freedom that fills the European atmosphere and that distinguishes the West from the East. He finds that in Europe people are always agitated about their political rights and are extremely jealous of interference with or suppression of popular rights and privileges. Life in England or in Europe is a great struggle—constant, unending struggle for light and liberty. Freedom from limitations and restrictions, removal of disqualifications and trammels, be they of any nature, perfect freedom from bondage of everykind, is the ever increasing and ever recurring cry of modern Europe. Democratic spirit is the key-note of Western civilization in all its branches and departments, but in politics it rules almost supreme. The government of the people, by the people and for the people is the ideal all over whether in Democratic England, Monarchical Germany, Autocratic Russia or Republican France. The press, the pulpit and the platform are all ringing with the cries "away with the tyrants and autocrats who stand in the way of democracy and who desire to check or stop the wheel of progress onwards or who have the audacity of trifling with the wishes of the people." One should be here in Europe to realize the truth of the above remarks on occasions when anything is done or attempted to be done by the various governments in power, which is opposed to the democratic spirit of the times or by which a popular demand is thrown out or anything else is done which is opposed to the wishes of the people or which does not tend to

Originally published in the *Hindusthan Review and Kayastha Samachar* Volume XII (1905), pp. 349-56. The article was written when Lajpat Rai was in England in 1905.

further their interests. In July last the rejection of the London Tramways Bill by the House of Lords afforded such an occasion. The City of London, as our readers know, is situated on the banks of the Thames. The river divides the city into two main divisions one on each side of the river, the tramways end on each side and are not allowed to run across the bridges. This results in great inconvenience to the people as they have to leave the tramway at one end of the river, cross the bridge on foot and then take another tramway at the other end. For busy London people, men and women, boys and girls who come to the city every day from miles for business and then return to their homes after business hours, this means a great waste of time and money. The London County Council, therefore, proposed to take their tramways across the bridges and thus add to the comfort and the convenience of that great mass of people who cannot afford to engage cabs and hansoms. The Bill passed in the House of Commons was rejected in the House of Lords on the ground that its acceptance involved the destruction of the spectacular effect of the bridges and would make them look ugly. The days and nights that followed the rejection of this bill presented a spectacle in London which required to be seen in order to be fully realized and which is past all description. People were mad with rage and frenzy and on all sides and from all quarters you heard the cry "down with the Lords," "down with these hereditary robbers and thieves." In clubs, in theatres, in political meetings, on the tramcars, on the buses, in trains, everywhere in fact, the audacity of the House of Lords was the one absorbing topic of discussion and comment, and the proposal for abolishing the House of Lords was being freely and seriously discussed. It found loud expression in the columns of the democratic press, was re-echoed in society papers and was exhibited on the stage. Angry resolutions were passed at the meetings of the London County Council and at other public meetings whether convened for that special purpose or not. For a few days the atmosphere was surcharged with revolutionary ideas. The semi-official liberal and radical press joined in the cry and demanded the abolition of the House of Lords as the only remedy. The Tory press could not but disapprove of the action of the Lords and was either discreetly silent or printed indifferent paragraphs. No serious attempt was made to defend the action of the Lords by anybody.

In short, the whole city seemed to be in state of ferment and the public mind was intensely agitated. Even the *Daily News*, the organ of the Whigs, demanded an abolition of the House of Lords. The country resounded with the cries of "end it or mend it." Almost immediately following this, came the defeat of the Government on Irish supplies and the statement of the Premier that he intended neither to resign nor to dissolve the Parliament. On this question, of course, the country was divided and the Whigs and the Tories sided with their respective parties. But even the Tory papers acknowledged that a crisis had come and in a suppressed tone the *Times* also admitted that a great constitutional issue had been raised.

One of the Radical extremists wrote :

"It is no less than Revolution ! The King is dead. Mr. Balfour has established an autocracy to supplant the monarchy. As defiant of the nation as the Tsar and his bureaucracy, he laughs at public opinions and governs by paper constitutions. He has only to propose a measure prolonging the life of the Government indefinitely and the cowardly criminals at his back aided by the land thieves in the hereditary chamber will pass it. Defeated in the House of Commons, he ignores a hostile vote and continues the government of incompetence and corruption. This is Revolution."

Another paper after lamenting that the real government of the country was not in the hands of the electorate but in those of the rich, wrote as follows : "Let us rejoice, then, that we have been reminded before the election and not after it, of the permanent Tory Opposition which will confront us after the battle is won. Now that we have the issue raised again, in sheer wantonness by the old and new nobility, let us not suffer it to be dropped. We will come into power in 1906, not only with a mandate upon the fiscal question and education and the publicans and Chinese slavery and labour legislation, but upon the monstrous survival of the bad old times which we call the House of Lords."

At about the same time occurred another incident which showed the ascendancy of the democratic spirit in this country. The Government announced what was practically a dropping of the Unemployed Bill and said there was no chance of the Bill being passed into law this session. This announcement met with a

chorus of disapproval from the public, and at once a number of monster demonstrations of the unemployed were organised.

Thousands of the unemployed assembled in different places and protested. In some cases thousands marched to London to prove to the Government the intensity of feeling on the subject.

At a meeting of the unemployed at Manchester a regular march to London was proposed. In discussing the proposed measure one of the speakers said : "They had no hesitation in declaring that such a march would be a menace to the towns they passed through, but if the Government wanted to prevent it, they must give the legislation asked for." Another speaker said that if in the opinion of the authorities, "Human life was not worth any consideration, they, the unemployed, would say that they were not prepared to consider property (Hear, Hear). They would take immediate steps to see to it that they had that which was necessary for their sustenance and they would not be particular where they got it." The demonstrations of the unemployed men were supplemented by similar demonstrations of the unemployed women, and the wives of the unemployed in London who eventually sent a deputation to the House of Commons to meet the Premier. The result was that all parties had to give in and the "Unemployed Bill" was taken up and passed into law

Then there is another question that has been agitating a section of the British public for several years past, *viz.*, the Education Act. This act forces the Non-Conformists to pay rates which they consider iniquitous. The Bill was passed in the teeth of a great and vigorous opposition and the Non-Conformists have not yet been reconciled to it. A great number of them every year refuse to pay taxes voluntarily and the same is realized by the seizure and distrain of their property. This has been going on for the last three years and still continues. The methods of agitation followed by the Irish nationalists are too significant and well known to need special mention. In the House of Commons they obstinately obstruct business and at times make the transaction of it almost impossible. In the country itself they throw as many difficulties in the way of the Government as they can.

Their success in these methods is well known and, as a result thereof, they have extorted many valuable concessions from unwilling

and hostile Parliaments. In other parts of Europe they go a step further and in the demand for political liberty have recourse to Anarchist methods, which at times culminate in murders, assassinations and crime. This is wicked no doubt, but it shows how intense is the desire for political liberty and at what risk and under what conditions people are striving to get it in their own way and according to their own means. Now, on seeing and studying all this, one cannot help contrasting the same with political conditions that prevail in India. Not that he necessarily wishes that all of these methods may be adopted by his countrymen but because he keenly feels by contrast the apathy, the indifference, the want of earnestness, the absence of a spirit of sacrifice for the cause and for the principle, the colossal timidity and the consequent failure of those who carry on political agitation in India. There are neither leaders nor followers who fully realize what political freedom is and what stupendous efforts and sacrifices are required of them in order to get to even the fringe of the same. One is apt to feel that a set of worldly-wise (or perhaps unwise), greedy and cowardly people as we are, we do not deserve a better treatment at the hands of our rulers than what they accord to us. Why ? What sacrifices do we undergo to deserve what we want ? Anything more than the trouble of attending the annual session of the Congress and enjoying a holiday ? Yes, a few do more than that. They write articles and deliver speeches. A few do even more than that, they subscribe small sums of money for the political propaganda. But what proportion does that bear to their incomes or to their expenditure on luxuries and holidays etc. you should not ask. Because in answer to that question even the greatest and the loudest of Indian patriots will have to hide his head in shame. But why be so hard on them ? Have they not big families, sons, grandsons, daughters, wives, mothers, and last but not the least, their great selves to provide for ? Why, have they not to leave estates, build palaces and otherwise provide for the dim uncertain future ? Yes, they have to do all that, and we have no quarrel with them for doing so. Only we object to their assuming that they are patriots. In our humble opinion no one is entitled to call himself a patriot who holds anything (excepting his religion, of course,) dearer than his country. But this is a very high and almost unapproachable ideal, you will say. Very well, let us in any case try to do something better and

more tangible than we have been doing heretofore. Let us, at the close of each year, feel certain of some progress. Let us take stock and say if we are, to be sure, making substantial progress. Looked at from this point of view even, I am afraid we cannot hold out a cheerful and promising record. Our past record shows that in truth, the struggle for freedom has not even yet commenced; we have done absolutely nothing to inaugurate it. The country is as yet wanting in those conditions which must precede the dawn of an era of real, earnest struggle.

Where are the political thinkers of the country, whose sole thought by day or by night, sleeping or waking, should be, how to initiate and carry on the struggle for freedom ? Where are the political Sanyasis whose sole work in life should be the preaching of the gospel of freedom, who should, even at the point of the bayonet, say with Galelio, "there they are, I see them moving" ? Where are the *Vaishyas* of the movement who will only earn and make money for the struggle and who will finance it ; who will live poorly and modestly and save every pie for the sacred cause in order not to let it suffer for want of the sinews of war ? And last but not least where are the people who will quietly, ungrudgingly, without complaint or murmur, suffer for the cause and in their persons prove the truth of the saying that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church" ? In short, where are the people who will raise agitation for political rights and liberty to the dignity of a church and live and die for the same ?

Let us look round and find out if there are men in the country who are fit to properly initiate and inaugurate the struggle for freedom. Bengal is renowned for its writers and speakers. Let some of its best sons consecrate their lives to the cause. Their only business in life should be to write books, tracts, pamphlets, articles and notes, also to give speeches all over the country expounding what liberty is, how it was won by other people and how it can be won by us. Let them seek no payment for their labours but what is sufficient for their sustenance. Let them build no houses, create no estates and live simple frugal lives. If possible let them be celibates. Maharashtra has justly earned a name for statesmanship and powers of organisation. Let some of its best sons consecrate their lives to the work of organising political movements in India. Our revered friend, Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak,

is one of the fittest persons to undertake the work, if the Government which has been persecuting him so long, is inclined to let him alone, which is not likely, he having roused its worst suspicions. Well, in that case, the best thing for him is to bid good-bye to his motherland, be a voluntary exile and take his residence somewhere abroad. He should devote himself to the task of influencing English and foreign public opinion in favour of political reforms in India. The other leader who is fitted to do this work is Mr. Gokhale. I may be pardoned for hazarding an opinion to the effect that the Supreme or any other Legislative Council Chamber is not the place for him. He has shown the way to others, he has proved to the world sufficiently that even poor Indians can hold their own against clever autocratic bureaucrats of the class of Lord Curzon, and that is enough. Let the non-official members of the Bombay Legislative Council find another representative champion for the Supreme Council and leave Mr. Gokhale alone, to be the whole-time Secretary of the Congress, to organise a central office, to go about, and guide the Provincial Congress Committees. The other provinces, also, should, if possible, prevail upon one or two capable persons in each centre to renounce their professions and take to the work of carrying on political agitation and spreading political propaganda.

If there are any provinces which cannot fix upon their own leaders, let them follow the lead of the better situated and more lucky ones and assist in bringing about one compact political organisation determined to carry on the struggle for political rights.

As to actual work, we think, the time has come for more vigorous measures and for a substantial change in the methods of our agitation.

Bengal has just shown the way in agitating against the Partition of Bengal. What Bengal has done should be done by every province in ventilating its grievances. Besides occasional provincial demonstrations like those recently held in Bengal, we ought to improve upon the general annual demonstration at the Congress session by arranging to bring about a greater and a bigger meeting every year attended by no less than a hundred thousand persons from all parts of India. The educational and the political value of such gatherings cannot be overestimated. Let the next session of the

Congress at Benaras set the example. Actual deliberative work should be done by a smaller conference attended by not more than a hundred of the best men of the country. Two whole days may be reserved for this work and one day, the opening day, for popular demonstration, at which speeches may be delivered to the assembled masses from different platforms by different men in their own vernaculars. The executive and administrative work of guiding the movement all round the year should be done by a still smaller standing Committee of twenty to thirty men. This Committee ought to meet at least twice or three times a year, and if Sir Pherozshah Mehta cannot spare time to attend its sittings at some central place, let us unanimously agree to fix Bombay as the head-quarters and meet only there. Or if that be not acceptable to our Bengal friends who are equally indispensable, let Bombay and Calcutta have the honour of being the meeting place every alternate year. For the sake of unanimity and for the sake of our motherland let us all agree to this, even though it may be inconvenient and expensive to Madrasis and Punjabis to do so.

Then the next thing which the whole country ought to do simultaneously with the above is the adopting of and giving effect to the Bengal resolutions regarding the boycotting of English goods. This in my opinion is the most effective way of bringing the Government to its senses and will be most telling on England. Even if we cannot do without foreign goods let us import them from Japan and China first and from Germany, France or the United States next. Let us try to gain the sympathy and good-will of the Indian retail-sellers, and there cannot be the least doubt that we can carry on an effective political propaganda. There is another thing which I would do *viz.*, to spread a knowledge of English laws and Regulations broadcast. Let the people realize the full significance of the laws under which they live and demand the full pound of flesh given to them by the same. If all these measures carried out for a number of years fail to make an impression upon the Government, though I am sure they will, then there will be time to think of more effective methods of constitutional agitation to bring about the desired reforms in the government of the country.

I have my own ideas about carrying on the Indian political campaign in England which I reserve for another occasion.

10. INDIA AND ENGLISH PARTY POLITICS

I AM OF opinion that those who talk of identifying the Congress with the Liberal Party in England, presume too much. Firstly, they assume without justification and, perhaps, against all experience that the Liberal Party, as a party, are prepared to open their arms to them. My experience tells me just the otherwise. It is true that the response to the circular letter of the Chairman of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, asking for platforms for Indian Delegates came mostly from the Liberal and Radical Associations of England, including Trade Unions, Labour and Socialist circles. It is equally true that what little hearing we received in England was given to us by the Liberals, but then we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the Liberal leaders and the Liberal executive kept themselves as much aloof as the Conservatives. These latter are in substantial agreement with the Conservatives in keeping Indian affairs, out of party politics. At the discussion of the last Budget in June there was only one influential Liberal (Sir Charles Dilke) who spoke in favour of Mr. Herbert Robert's motion for a Parliamentary enquiry. The other leading Liberals went in a body against it. You have only to be few days in England to come to the conclusion that the Liberal executive is as indifferent to the Indian affairs as the Conservative and that as a party the Liberals are not prepared to receive our advances. For the time being some of them may utilise you for party purposes in those matters in which they differ from their rivals, the Tories, but beyond that they will not go. As such, it is futile to discuss the wisdom or the non-wisdom of identifying the Congress with the Liberals as a party. The question is, at present, outside the range of practical politics.

Reproduced from *The Panjabee* of 11 December 1905. Originally published in *The Indian Review*, Volume VI No. 11, (November 1905).

Though it were possible to do so, I would rather have the Indian affairs fought and discussed on party lines. So far I am quite in agreement with Sir Pherozshah Mehta. Any one even slightly acquainted with political life in England will tell you that as a rule, English politicians are not prepared to devote any time and attention to any matter which does not further party interest. Matters outside party politics receive hardly any consideration. Nobody cares for the same. People do not feel sufficiently interested to spare any time or attention for matters which do not seem to concern them in any way. The Press cannot afford to spare space for them for it does not pay them. The man in the street is absorbed in his own affairs. The ordinary citizen or voter argues that a matter upon which both parties agree and hold the same views must be well looked after and needed no care on his part. To be just and fair to English Liberals, I must say that those who could be approached were found to be very sympathetic and for the time being at least appeared to have been touched by the tale of woe narrated before them. Some of the them passed resolutions of sympathy and so on, but beyond that I don't believe they will take any further trouble of pressing it either on their representatives in the House of Commons or on their party leaders as such. So far the greatest sympathy has been expressed by the Labour and Democratic and Socialist circles. The working men in England are now awake and they are as much disgusted with the present system of class Government as we are. They are pushing forward their own candidates and they hope to return a solid body of Labour members in the next General Election[1]. The Democratic and Socialist sections are in favour of Home Rule for India and so, of course, are the Irish. These are the people upon whose active sympathy Indians can safely rely and who might help Indians if they are sufficiently strong to make themselves heard. But they are poor, and poverty in England is, perhaps, a greater curse and calamity than anywhere else in the world. They generally denounce the Liberals, as well as the Conservatives, though their members in Parliament seem to have a certain sort of alliance with the Liberals. They are perfecting their organisations and are advancing steadily. The Socialists and the Democrats are allied with them. I was much impressed with their sincerity of purpose and genuineness of sympathy, and am of opinion that it is this class only with which at present an alliance is possible, if any. It is no

doubt true, that in high Whig circles this class is not looked upon with favour and very reasonably too. They aim at their overthrow and claim a share of the power of which the former have been enjoying an exclusive monopoly so far. The fact that of all countries in the European world, England is the most conservative and very slow to adopt new ideas makes it probable that the Labour and Democratic influence will take a long time to develop and to attain the power which they aim at. But all the same it is hopeless to expect anything at the hands of the Liberals for India. When in power they might send a sympathetic Viceroy but that they cannot and will not follow systematic, persistent policy of advance in applying democratic principles of government to India, is as certain as that the sun will set this evening and rise tomorrow morning.

There are some good Liberals who sincerely desire to rule India on sound liberal principles, but at present they are in a hopeless minority, their voices do not count for much and there is little chance of their gaining any prominence or coming to the front Benches in the near future.

Under the circumstances, the only advice I can offer to my countrymen is as follows :

1. That they should mainly look to themselves and their own exertions for political progress. The English voter, whether Liberal or Conservative, is a sympathetic creature no doubt, but then he is absorbed in his own troubles and affairs and to care for us has neither the time nor the inclination to attend to anything which does not directly concern him or which is likely to affect his pocket injuriously.

2. That if there is any class in England which deserves our confidence and upon whose votes we can place any reliance at all it is the Labour party, including the Democrats and the Socialists and the Irish, of course.

11. PUNJAB'S SYMPATHY WITH BENGAL

WE ARE assembled here today for two-fold purposes, the principal of which is to express heartfelt sympathy with our brethren of Bengal in their present troubles. As subjects of the same Government and members of the same nationality it is our duty to speak out when we see that a handful of government officials are trampling under foot the best traditions of administration which have been established by British Law as made and promulgated by some of the greatest statesmen that England has yet produced. It will be suicidal to sit silent when we see that the government of law and goodwill is being substituted for a government by force and by military terrorism. It will be criminal to shut our eyes when we find that British modes of administration are being changed for Russian models and that the hitherto professedly constitutional form of government is being openly converted into an irresponsible military despotism. The highest dictates of loyalty demand that the people of India should speak out at such a juncture and should speak out sufficiently loud and quite unambiguously so as to reach the ears of those who are ultimately responsible for the good government of this country. What is a government if not an embodiment of law? True, it possesses the power of changing the law but only after observing certain forms. So long as the law stands and has not been changed in accordance with established procedure, practice and constitution, the law is binding both on the government and the people. It is, therefore, the highest loyalty to protest whenever the people find that the executive is inclined to break the law and to assume a power which the law does not give them. Loyalty to law is loyalty to government. If it is loyalty to

Speech delivered by Lala Lajpat Rai at a protest meeting held at Lahore on 9 December 1905 under the auspices of the Indian Association. Reproduced from *The Panjabee* of 11 December 1905.

support the government in all its constitutional functions and to defend it against all attacks made upon it by enemies, it is still greater loyalty to defend the law even against the government itself. I have, therefore, no doubt that we are perfectly loyal to the law of the land when we protest against the illegal and unconstitutional acts of the local Government of Bengal, whereby the latter aim at terrifying the people of those provinces who are carrying on a strictly legal and constitutional agitation against the split of their beloved province into two. What can be meaner than the attempt made to coerce the parents by striking at their children and what can be more ridiculous than the attempt to justify a reign of terror on the ground that some school boys were displaying a spirit of rowdyism. That the repressive circulars and proclamations of the Government in Bengal are illegal, have been declared by the highest law officer of the Crown ; we mean the Advocate-General of Calcutta.[1]

But gentlemen, over and above the illegal circulars we have the extraordinary procedure of the Government of Eastern Bengal in establishing a reign of military terrorism in Barisal[2]. We have to enter an emphatic protest against the same, because we think that steps like these are not only uncalled for in the present state of things but because we believe that steps like these are direct incentives to those violent methods of agitation which none of us sincerely desires to see being introduced in India. Gentlemen, in my opinion the so-called Gurkha rule in Bengal is a very disastrous affair, full of ominous meaning not only as a dangerous precedent but as a confession of the weakness and resourcelessness of the Government. An established government, who has a right to claim the affection and attachment of its people, whose chief security lies in the goodwill of the people and in their belief in its sense of justice and respect for law, could not have committed a greater blunder than a display of military power on an occasion like this Now it is not my intention to minimise the seriousness of the situation in Bengal. That business best pays the Anglo-Indian Press for whom it may perhaps be necessary from a business point of view to ridicule every genuinely Indian movement and by under-estimating its force. It has after all to please its clientele which consist either of government officials or of Anglo-Indian merchants. The former very naturally do not like to be told of their mistakes and blunders and are not likely to pay for papers which do not sufficiently respect their feelings and prejudices. The Anglo-Indian

merchants too are directly interested in belittling the importance of the Swadeshi movement. They have a common cause with the officials. An Englishman is nothing if not business-like and it is a sign of the times that the business instincts of the average Anglo-Indian do not enable him to see much in advance. It has been the privilege of the Anglo-Indian Press from time to time to fix dates for the final dissolution of the anti-partition agitation. So far they have been compelled to postpone it from day to day probably because their clients could not furnish them with sufficient evidence to pronounce the final verdict. This time a final date has been fixed as immediately after the next meeting of the Indian National Congress Fortunately the postponement is not so long as sometimes happens to be the case in our own Chief Court and we shall not have to wait for long to see the vindication of the great occult powers which the *Pioneer* has of late seemed to acquire in abundance.

Now to revert, I am pointing out that though the situation in Bengal is sufficiently serious to deserve the best consideration of British statesmen now at the helm of affairs here and also of the Cabinet at home, there is nothing in it which can justify the extraordinary step of handing over a whole town to the military. The people of Bengal have done nothing illegal in resolving on the boycott of English goods as a political weapon. Some supporters of the Swadeshi movement may hold that in the interest of Swadeshi movement itself the step was not perhaps wise but they forget that but for this agitation the Swadeshi movement may never have come to prominence soon and might have failed to elicit that response which it has now.

Boycott was really started as a political weapon to bring pressure upon the great English nation at home and it has already served the very useful purpose of bringing round Indians to a sense of their duty towards the industrial problem of their own country. So far there is no reason to regret it. It has brought about a healthy change in the economical indifference that prevailed in this country, drawing the attention of the people to the possibilities that lie near at hand of saving the economic ruin of their country and by checking its exploitation without the intervention of the Government, by adopting measures which the Government should have enforced by law and which the same has, hitherto in the interests of the British merchants, failed to do.

While on the one hand the Swadeshi movement is calculated to give an impetus to Indian industries and manufacturers, the boycott movement on the other hand aims at the protection of the same from unequal and unscrupulous competition from without. It is not our intention to discuss whether the latter view is sound or not when judged by the orthodox standard of political economy but that it is a perfectly legitimate weapon to be wielded by a law-abiding people, we have no doubt. If so, any attempt to persecute those people who have resolved to use this weapon for political purpose, is illegal, unconstitutional and unjustifiable and under the circumstances every Indian, whether he accepts the boycott movement as sound or not, can legitimately sympathise with our countrymen in Bengal in their present trouble and protest against the persecution to which they are being subjected. We know that some Government officials are at the present moment carrying on a nefarious trade by setting class against class and classes against masses. We also know that they have here and there succeeded in winning over some of our Mahomedan brethren to their side but we are not at all discomfited by that because we believe that all this is only natural, in fact, encouraging. This sort of diplomacy is usually one of the last weapons that are wielded in self-defence by tottering despotisms. The Congress agitation was the first articulate protest against English despotism in India. As soon as the protest was made the despotism set itself to the task of dividing the people and fanning class and religious prejudices. Ever since, Mahomedans have been set against Hindus, Sikhs against both, agriculturists against money lenders and so on. The trade has the great charm of looking at first sight to be a paying one. It is, no doubt, very profitable for those who act as the tools of the Government in spreading this propaganda but that it is in the long run a very dangerous game both for the Government as well as for the people at large is proved by the events that are at present happening in Russia. It contains within itself some inflammable elements which once let loose in the end spare neither friend nor foe. To those who have any doubt in the matter I will commend a serious study of Russian politics within the last century. I, therefore, take this opportunity of appealing to all my countrymen irrespective of caste or creed not to allow themselves to be made the tools of officials in spreading disunion amongst our people.

Beware, gentlemen, of the cunning, wily appeals, sometimes flattering, sometimes threatening, sometimes made in the name of religion, at others in the name of religious nationality, sometimes pleading in the name of past greatness, at others setting up the phantoms of a great future, separate from the rest of the people of this country. Remember we are inhabitants of one country, breathe in the same atmosphere, in our veins runs practically the same blood, we are the common inheritors of a glorious past, united we stand and divided we fall. The present is a critical time in the history of our country. We are just now in the throes of a great crisis. If at this juncture we fail to realise our responsibilities as Indians we set back the tide of progress by a number of years. I say advisedly for a number of years because I have a firm conviction that our progress as a nation may be impeded but it cannot be altogether stopped. Beware, then, gentlemen, of those creeping counsels of discord and disunion which are often breathed in your ears in words of honey and in accents of affection and sympathy. There are signs on the horizon and all those who have eyes can see the same that the process of disillusionment has commenced and both Hindus and Mahomedans have begun to see far.

My appeal to you does not mean that you should cease to be Hindus or Mahomedans. Nay if you do that I will cease to respect you. By all means love your respective religions as deeply as you can, try to serve your respective communities to the best of your ability, nay even exert to strengthen them between themselves, but never play in the hands of the common enemy whoever he may be. The British Government as representative of the British nation, is not our enemy, though we cannot say the same of those who try to divide us, to persecute us, to insult us, to trample upon our cherished rights and privileges, Loyalty to the British Government does not demand loyalty to these latter officials. They are themselves disloyal to their own Government in so far as they try to defy the constitution and the law and thereby weaken British rule in India, and in so far as they alienate the affections and the sympathy of the people from that rule.

When, therefore, I ask you to sympathise with your brethren in Bengal over their misfortunes, I ask you irrespective of your caste and creed, irrespective of your belief in the soundness of the boycott movement and irrespective of your opinion on the Partition of

Bengal. One word to my Mahomedan brethren. Suppose, gentlemen, the Government were to extend the same treatment to such of you as are inclined to support the Sultan of Turkey in his troubles with European Powers, will you not naturally expect your Hindu fellow subjects to sympathise with you and to support you in exercise of your constitutional rights and privileges. What is at the present moment being done in Bengal may at any moment be repeated in the Punjab. What is at the present moment meted out to Hindus principally may at any minute be extended to Mahomedans also. It is a question of principle for which we stand, upon which we ought to record a unanimous protest. The principle is our right to carry on a constitutional agitation against what we consider to be high-handed and unjust acts of the Government. The Government has no right to coerce the agitators or repress them so long as they are within the bounds of law. The law is sufficiently strong and comprehensive to punish all breaches of the same and all defiance to constituted authority. And no case has yet been made out for any extraordinary steps or for the intervention of the military. It is a pity that the officials in Bengal should have failed to grasp the situation, as well as to apply true statesmanlike remedies. It is a still greater pity that they should have stooped so low as to adopt these petty tactics which are so much in evidence in Bengal just now. To the enemies of England the events in Bengal may give occasion for joy but to the friends of the same they can only afford grounds for feelings of shame.

Gentlemen, it is a matter of real concern to see that the resources of the Government in statesmanship should have fallen so low as to necessitate the use of Gurkhas for intimidating the proverbially timid Bengali. In his haughtiness and in the security of his office Mr. Fuller[3] could not evidently see the loss of dignity and prestige which his acts were likely to entail. Like ordinary bureaucrats he probably thought it statesmanlike to overawe the people by a show of military strength. If so, we can only pity him as he was greatly mistaken if he thought that this show of militarism was likely to quell the agitation and to bring the people to their knees. Measures like these are always double edged tools and it is a matter of sincere regret that the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal did not profit by a study of history which, as a member of the Civil Service he must be presumed to know sufficiently well.

In the end, gentlemen, and especially you students, I wish to impress upon you the importance of being strictly within the law, and of keeping your heads quite cool and calm. Let your hearts be warm and responsive to every noble sentiment, but keep your heads cool whatever happens and whatever trials you have to undergo and however great the troubles you have to face.

12. REPRESSIVE MEASURES IN BENGAL

I AM afraid I cannot deliver a speech in the strain which we have been hearing on the resolution on the "Partition of Bengal"[1] and the present resolution before you. I give it my heartiest support on two grounds. You have been hearing of the misfortunes of our brethren of Bengal. I am rather inclined to congratulate them on the splendid opportunity to which an all-wise Providence, in his dispensation, has afforded to them by heralding the dawn of a new political era for this country . I think the honour was reserved for Bengal, as Bengal was the first to benefit by the fruits of English education. Bengal, up to this time—excuse me for saying that—the Bengal lion, by some cause, had degenerated into a jackal, and I think Lord Curzon has done us a great service by provoking the lion in his own den and rousing him to a sense of consciousness of his being a lion. I think no greater service could have been done to India, to the cause of India or to Bengal, by any other statesman. There are times, gentlemen, when I am inclined to pray that from time to time God might be pleased to send Viceroys like Lord Curzon to this country, in order to awaken the people of this country to a sense of their responsibility in this matter. Gentlemen, I believe, and I believe earnestly, that the political struggle has only commenced and it was only in the fitness of things that when the Congress attained its majority, the attaining of that majority should have been preceded by a manly and vigorous protest on the part of the people of this country. It is only in the fitness of things that the movement's coming to age of majority

Speech delivered at the 21st session of the Indian National Congress held at Banaras on 29 December 1905, while supporting the Resolution (No. XIII) protesting against the repressive measures in Bengal. The Resolution was moved by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. Reproduced from the *Report of the 21st Session of the Indian National Congress.*

should have been preceded by a vigorous and manly declaration of its approaching manhood. I think in the circumstances like ours, in conditions like ours, we are perfectly justified in taking the attitude that our brethren of Bengal have taken. What else was left for you? It has been explained that all possible things that could be done in the name of constitutional agitation have been exhausted. What was the example given to you by your fellow-subjects in the other parts of the Empire? Englishmen have been our teachers in all branches of human knowledge. Englishmen have given us constitutional rights. Was it not perfectly right to take a page from the book of the Englishman on the methods of constitutional agitation and adopt those methods which will be appreciated by themselves? Now, let us see what Englishmen in England do. I do not say that our conditions allow of our exactly copying or imitating them, but surely we have a right to adopt that spirit, understand that spirit and follow it. Let me tell you what are the methods adopted by Englishmen in England when they have a grievance to be listened to by Government. The method which is perfectly legitimate, perfectly constitutional and perfectly justifiable, is the method of passive resistance. Although I am not at the present moment quoting any social democrat or labourman, I must admire them; I have great respect for them. I must tell you that the message which the people of England wanted to send to you through me was the message that in our utterances, in our agitations and in our fight and struggle for liberty, we ought to be more manly than we have been heretofore (cheers). An Englishman hates or dislikes nothing like beggary. I think a beggar deserves to be hated. Therefore, it is our duty to show to the Englishmen that we have risen to the sense of consciousness, that we are no longer beggars and that we are subjects of an Empire where people are struggling to achieve that position which is their right by right of natural law. Gentlemen, at every stage people were arbiters of their destiny, but we are not so at the present moment. We are perfectly justified in trying to become arbiters of our own destiny and in trying to obtain freedom. I think the people of Bengal ought to be congratulated on being leaders of that march in the van of progress. I rather envy them. I am rather jealous of them; at the same time I am proud of them. They have begun the battle, they have begun the fight and they have begun it in right manly style. They have effaced all those taunts, they have effaced

all those insinuations against them of being timid and cowardly; they have exhibited a manliness, they have exhibited a spirit in this battle which has to be commended to other Provinces of India. If the other Provinces of India will Just follow their example, I say the day is not far from distant sights. But if you simply go there as a beggar without the consciousness of your power, of your right to demand your rights, you go there simply to be rejected. If, therefore, you want to be heard, and you want to be heard with respect, you must approach with determination, with evidences of determination, with signs that you are determined to achieve your rights at any cost. Unless you do that, the goddess of liberty is very jealous. She shall never allow you to approach her, and she shall never allow you to enter her portals. You must remain outside because you are profane; you cannot enter because you are not sufficiently pure ; you must purify yourselves through the ordeals of fire and self-sacrifice. The goddess of liberty is the most sacred goddess in the world, and before you can approach her, you should show by your life, life of self-denial, that you are fit to enter her temple (cheers). What have we been doing to be fit to approach that temple. I am afraid that our record is extremely poor and extremely humiliating ; it is extremely bad to look at. But there are signs of the rising sun. And if the people of India will just learn that lesson from the people of Bengal, I think the struggle is not hopeless. We are just awakening to a sense of our duty and a sense of responsibility to the motherland. It may be that with the consciousness of that strength we may tread the right way, the right path in the struggle for freedom. I have only to say one word about that part of the resolution which deals with repressive measures. I think the repressive policy of this government is very encouraging. A government commanding 2,60,000 or 5,00,000 soldiers stooping to strike us by striking at our boys ! I say what have these wise statesmen of government come to. Are they not displaying disgraceful weakness, a weakness of which the people are conscious? It will be difficult for them to remain where they are. What would people conclude that this mighty government, with so many guns and cannons, with so many armies and with such an array of statesmen, have begun to fight with boys. We say that as friends of order, as friends of peaceful progress, as friends of the present government, because we are not ungrateful. We advise them to

eschew these weak methods, disgraceful methods, and re-assert their manliness by pursuing paths of righteousness. If we were to adopt the methods of revolutionists, if we were to adopt the same secret methods which the government of Lord Curzon has adopted in pushing forth the Partition Scheme, if we were to adopt the same methods that the Government of India and bureaucratic rulers are adopting in dividing people against people, in setting the Hindu against the Mahomedan, the Hindu against the Sikh, it will be a dangerous game. I say that the government is giving weapons which are sharp but which are disgraceful and which show signs of weakness. I, therefore, say that it is a dangerous game which the government is playing. It might injure them at any moment. Therefore, as friends of the government, as friends of order, we warn the government against treading this path of danger and difficulty. Let Government remember, and let you, gentlemen, also remember, that people once awakened and awakened rightly cannot be put down. It is impossible for the Government of India, after a century of British rule, after a century of liberal education, after having put the books of Burke, Paine and Mason in our hands, to put us down like dogs and slaves. That is impossible. The Bengalis have just now shown, they are only now showing, that the task is impossible even for a mighty government like the British government, Therefore, wisdom requires, statesmanship requires, that people should be governed on right lines, on liberal principles, on those democratic principles which are just now stirring the whole world. The wave of democracy is out. I defy any government in the world where there is any just civilization to keep the people out of their rights for any length of time. The history of Europe is before you. What is the fate of autocratic methods? We pray our government not to adopt those methods. As my friend the Chairman has been telling the English audiences, the British government is foolish in following Russian methods. We are great admirers of British rule. As people who are benefited by that rule we call upon the government not to trample under foot the best traditions of British rule, but to retrace those steps and not leave the people of this country under the impression that their government is going to adopt nothing better than Russian methods. If these methods continue, gentlemen, what will be the difference between the Russian government and the British government? There will be

nothing left for the people of this country to be loyal to the British government if these things are taken away—if the rights of meetings, if the rights of petitions and if the rights of constitutional agitation are taken away from us. Let my governors tell me what shall be left to us to be loyal to them? Why shall we be loyal to them? I, therefore, say that it is in their own interests that they ought to retrace their steps and follow the noble example which has been set by some of their noblest statesmen, and remedy the state of things that exists. One word more and I have done. I see the time is going fast (cries of "go on"). No, I am not going to break the rule. I think I have already exceeded the limits. There is only one word I should like to say. If you have adopted this manly and vigorous policy, be prepared for the logical consequence. Don't conceal your heads, don't behave like cowards. Once having adopted that manly policy, stick to it till the last. Glorify yourselves as I have told you. Is it not a a matter of shame for us that this National Congress in the last twenty-one years should not have produced at least a number of political Sanyasis that could sacrifice their lives for the political regeneration of the country? Now that the Congress has come to a stage when it could become a father, a parent, I earnestly appeal to you to let it have its legitimate offsprings : a band of earnest missionaries to work out the political regeneration of the country. There is no use of our talking aloud, there is not much use of our showing signs of discontent and disaffection, unless we are true to ourselves, true to our noble country, true to the motherland, true to the cause of political regeneration and political agitation. If you show, in a few years, to our rulers that we are steadfast in our determination, that we are steadfast in our devotion to our cause, I assure you that there is no power in the world that can prevent you from going forward.

13. THE SWADESHI MOVEMENT

It is commonly supposed that there are two sides of the Swadeshi movement, one the political and the other the economic. Pure Swadeshi, as some of the Anglo-Indians choose to call it, is an economic movement and they profess to have a great sympathy for the same. Boycott of foreign made goods is held to be a political weapon upon the uses and ethics of which there is a great divergence of opinion. The Anglo-Indians can see nothing but mischief in it. In their opinion it is morally wrong, politically pernicious and economically unsound and impracticable. But there are a number of Europeans and Americans who see nothing pernicious in it and consider it to be not only a perfectly legitimate weapon but a very powerful and effective one to bring pressure upon any imperial race having commerce as its principal business. Amongst the Indians themselves different classes of people look at it from different points of view. Firstly, there is that class who can never see differently from their Anglo-Indian patrons. The opinions of this class do not count for much and need not be considered at all. Secondly, there are those, who both by nature and habit are in favour of peace at any cost. They cannot approve of any methods which are calculated to cause the least disturbance in the relations of the different persons and communities, whether Indians or aliens, who are in some way or other interested in India. These good people have great faith in moral persuasion and prayers—prayers addressed to the Great Ruler of the Universe as well as to our rulers in affairs mundane. They believe that a combined force of these two is sure to bring about a quiet, bloodless, moral revolution in India which will set matters right and remove all the political disqualifications and disabilities from which the Indians at present suffer and which result in so much hardship, oppression and wrong to the people of this country.

Originally printed in the *Indian Review*, Volume VII (1906) pp. 333-36.

Personally I am a believer in the efficacy of prayer as an instrument of religious discipline but it will require a great stretch of imagination and inconceivable amount of credulity on my part to accept that prayer to the Almighty, coupled with prayers to the ruling nation, are likely to lead to any practicable results in matters political and international. Prayers to the Almighty may be useful in intensifying your desire for political liberty and political privileges. Prayers to the ruling nation may be useful to you in proving the uselessness of appealing to the higher sense of man in matters political, where the interests of one nation clash with those of another and in driving you to the conclusion that human nature, constituted as it is, is extremely selfish and is not likely to change or bend unless the force of circumstances compels it to do so in spite of itself. But beyond this I cannot pin my faith on prayers. The third class of Indians consists of those estimable gentlemen who believe in the righteousness of the British nation as represented by the electors of Great Britain and Ireland and who are afraid of offending them by the boycott of English made goods. If there are any two classes into which the British nation can roughly be divided they are either manufacturers or the working men. Both of them are interested in keeping the Indian market open for the sale and consumption of their manufactures. Any movement aiming at the closing or contracting of this market is sure to offend them. They are said to be our only friends to whom we can appeal against the injustice of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy. Offend them, say these friends, and you are undone. You lose the goodwill of the only class who can help you and who are prepared to listen to your grievances. But these good friends forget that, boycott or no boycott, any movement calculated to increase the manufacturing power of India is likely to incur the displeasure of the British Elector. The latter is a very well educated animal, a keen man of business who can at once see through things that are likely to affect his pocket, however cleverly they might be put or arranged by those who hold an interest which is really adverse to his. He is not likely to be hood-winked by the cry of Swadeshi *minus* the boycott, because really speaking and effectively worked and organised both are one and the same.

The Swadeshi aims at the production of those articles at home which are at present imported from abroad. The boycott means the discontinuance of the consumption of those articles not made in this

country. So far, then, it is not likely to be of much use to drop the boycott in order to secure for us the continuation of the friendly attitude of the British Elector. But then we may go a step further and maintain that up till now the alleged friendliness of the British Elector has been of no good to us. Past experience shows that they have more than once stood between the people of India and some of its more nobleminded Anglo-Indian rulers whenever the latter tried to obtain economic justice for the former. The latter from their knowledge of the growing seriousness of the economic situation in India have now and then made a bold stand for justice to India against the demands of the British manufacturer, but they have almost always had to give in because the latter proved too strong for them. Here then we are on the horns of a dilemma. To our wrongs the British Elector is indifferent, to our rights, even if supported by good Englishmen in India, they have been opposed. The British Elector has no doubt a sympathetic ear to the tales of wrong and oppression that you may carry to England but unfortunately he is too busy and too absorbed in his own affairs to spare any time to listen to your tales or to take a serious view of them. The burden of the empire is too heavy to be conveniently shifted from the shoulders of a few—magnificently paid for the work—to those of the English people. The struggle for wealth, for luxury, is too keen and too intense to leave the latter any leisure or inclination for the study of the ethics of imperialism. Under the circumstances the sympathy of the British Elector is for the present at least a negligible quantity. The question directly put comes to this;—are the British prepared to give us full political privileges in exchange for open markets for their goods ? Any attempt to answer this in the affirmative must be put down as chimerical. But even granting that the argument has some force, is it not worth our while to impress upon the Britons at home the enormity of the wrongs inflicted upon us by their representatives here in this country, by supplementing the Swadeshi by boycott ? Admitting that Englishmen at home have the power to set matters right how are you to force their attention to the state of things in India except by directly threatening their pockets ? The logic of losing business is more likely to impress this nation of shopkeepers than any arguments based on the ethics of justice and fair-play. The British people are not a spiritual people. They are either a fighting race or a commercial nation. It will be like throwing pearls before swine to appeal to them in the name of higher morality or justice or

on ethical grounds. They are a self-reliant, haughty people, who can appreciate self-respect and self-reliance even in their opponents. It is then for the Indians to decide whether they mean to continue to appeal to them in the name of political justice, fair-play or whether they intend to attract their attention to the existing intolerable condition of things in India by inflicting losses in business and by adopting an attitude of retaliatory self-reliance.

But then there is another class of Indians who tread on more solid ground than any of those spoken of above. This is the class who oppose the boycott on economic grounds. Here we feel we are on more substantial ground. There is no plea of expediency, nor does it arise out of fear of the authorities in India or of the British Elector at home. Their warning note has a scientific basis and deserves the most careful and attentive consideration of all patriotic Indians. Whether Free Trader or Protectionist, you cannot dismiss them offhand nor treat their reasoning with contempt. They may be fadists (a term which in their turn they apply to Swadeshists) but they are neither cowards nor traitors. Speaking for myself I am an out and out Swadeshist and have been so for the last twenty-five years, in fact ever since I learnt for the first time the true meaning of the word patriotism. For me the words Swadeshi and patriotism are synonymous though I do not maintain or insinuate that those who are free-traders are not patriots. I advisedly do not say "not Swadeshists," because I am not prepared to say that those Indians who are free-traders are not necessarily Swadeshists. Be it as it may, I am personally inclined to attach the greatest importance possible to the Swadeshi movement. I look upon it as the remedy upon the right and on continued use of which depends the alleviation of the sufferings of our country. I regard it as the salvation of my country. The Swadeshi ought to make us self-respecting, self-reliant, self-supporting, self-sacrificing and last, but not least, manly. The Swadeshi ought to teach us how to organise our capital, our resources, our labour, our energies and our talents to the greatest good of all Indians, irrespective of creed, colour or caste. It ought to unite us—our religious and denominational differences notwithstanding. It ought to furnish us with an altar before which we can all stand in the fullest sincerity of our hearts and in the deepest strength of faith to pray for the good of our common motherland, with a determination to stand together and work together. In my opinion the Swadeshi ought to be the common

religion of United India. But all this notwithstanding, as a practical Swadeshist, I want a better understanding of the economic needs and requirements of the country and a practical programme of industrial development based on scientific calculations. As an indication of the lines upon which I shall like this programme to be framed, I cannot do better than quote from a very famed paper, from the Journal of the Royal Economic Society of London for the month of March 1906, under the heading of 'Protection of Infant Industries.' Discussing the economic effects of a protective tariff the writer remarks:

"We see that when the import of goods is checked, the exchanges are affected in a way which tends to raise prices at home; and that this rise continues until importation is again possible, unless such heavy duties are imposed that the country can be cut off both from importation and from exportation, and so become entirely self-contained. We find also in this process the explanation of the fact that the relief afforded by a protective tariff is frequently of a somewhat temporary character. For a few months the home producer has the field to himself ; then his costs of production gradually rise ; at last he finds foreign competition pressing on him once more; and finally he falls back upon the fatal demand for more Protection.

"But this—the common course of protection in both the new and the old countries—is not the only possible course in theory. It is caused, so far as I can see, principally by the attempt to do too much at once. Your new country is inclined to be generous to its home manufacturers, and to start manufacturing in all lines at once; by so doing it fritters away energy, and spreads expenditure over a wide field which if concentrated might produce imposing results.

"For, supposing that a new country would consent to do one or two things at a time, its difficulties would probably be far less. If it started, for instance, by attempting to found one textile or one branch of metallurgical industry, it could afford to give to its infant for a few years a genuine and important assistance. Gold prices would, of course, still be to some extent affected, but in an infinitely smaller degree than when a dead set is made against all manufactured goods at once. And by concentrating the money which is available on one end instead of dividing it among several hundreds, more real progress would indubitably be made. After all, under modern conditions, no industry ought to remain an infant for more than five years :

during those years it probably needs more assistance than can be easily given it under a general Protective system; later on, the less help it has, the better.

"Other important gains could be made—both political and economic—by this system of concentration. In the first place, the opportunities for log-rolling would certainly be diminished. If the system were once established, a most salutary division of the protectionist forces would assuredly take place; as it is, the tendency in many countries is for everybody to favour protection on the off chance that he may make more by it than he loses; on the system proposed everybody would know that only one or two industries were to be protected at a time, and those only for a few years. Again, the present certainty that a protective system will last much longer than there is any need for it, would be removed. For, as only one or two industries would receive help at any one time, all the other industries would combine to reduce that time to a minimum in the hope that their turn would come next."

In my opinion, the leaders of the Swadeshi movement including men actually engaged in business ought to put their heads together and promulgate an industrial pronouncement for the next five years, prepared on the lines indicated in the above extract.

14. INDIAN PATRIOTISM TOWARDS THE EMPIRE

IN MAY last (1906) the Director of Public Instruction of the Punjab issued a circular order to all the headmasters and managers of Government, aided and unaided schools in the Province, requiring them to celebrate the Empire-day in a certain way. One of the items of the programme laid down by him for observance was "the recitation of Urdu poems on loyalty to the Crown of England and patriotism towards the Empire." We do not know if the head of the Punjab Education Department was responsible for the wording of the above clause. The document seemed to bear on it abundant marks of that jingo statesmanship which has for a number of years been in ascendancy in the councils of tish Empire. One thing, however, is clear. The Government was sensible enough not to declare the Empire-day as a public holiday. The compulsory celebration of the Empire-day in 1906 was therefore confined to the schools, may be, to the schools of the Punjab only. We propose to examine in this paper if the step taken was educationally sound and in any way calculated to improve the moral tone of the schools where it was, by order, enforced.

Till lately the impression was that the British were, at least, frank by nature and valued frankness and sincerity on the part of others, however distasteful and unpleasant at times, these may be to their imperial temper. The idea was that although conscious of the unnaturalness of their rule over alien races, they aimed at making it as pleasant and benevolent as they possibly could (if ever it is possible to make subjection pleasant and benevolent) consistently with the making of the largest profit out of it for themselves. Of course, nobody having sufficient experience of human nature ever

Originally published in the *Hiudustan Review and the Kayastha Samachar*, Volume XIV (1906), pp. 420-28.

took the Britisher at his word, when the latter professed to be moved by unselfish and altruistic motive in extending his rule over other nations and countries and governing them solely for the sake of humanity and civilization. All the same, people believed that the British administration had not lost all sense of frankness and sincerity, until the new docrtine of the white man's burden was propounded by the banjo-bards, and the jingo poets had forced their muse to sing of the great sacrifices which the white man underwent in his civilizing mission and his humane rule, undertaken for the sole benefit of the ruled. But even the jingoes, whether poets or statesmen, never thought of appealing to the subject races in the name of "Patriotism towards the Empire" for the simple reason that in the mouths of the latter the expression was an absurdity and a contradiction in terms. The subject races—the fact of whose subordination to Great Britain alone, confers upon the latter, the status and dignity of an Empire—may be loyal, whether, voluntarily or involuntarily, by free will, or by necessity, but to attempt to raise this sense of loyalty to the dignity of patriotism is sheer nonsense. No lexicographer, of any position whatsoever, will risk his reputation by speaking, even by inference of "Patriotism towards the Empire." The idea is monstrous and is for the first time being introduced into the English language by the presumptuous genius of the jingoes as an antidote towards the sacred sentiment of patriotism, in the development of which amongst the subject races, they see a dangerous enemy to their own despotic rule. The lexicographers, if they can be accepted as reliable guides, in explaining the meaning of English words to us, almost unanimously agree in expressing the general opinion as to patriotism signifying "love of country." Johnson defines it as "zeal for one's country" and Webster as "the passion which aims to serve one's country." The *Encyclopaedic Dictionary* says that patriotism is "devotion to the interest and welfare of one's country" and the *Century Dictionary* as "the passion which moves a person to serve his country either in defending it from invasion or protecting its rights and maintaining its land and institutions" and so on and so forth. But how can a subject race governed by another be patriotic towards its rulers passes one's comprehension, unless one accepts the theory that the latter rules solely for the benefit of the former ? Even in this case it is love of his own country and certainly not patriotism towards the empire (signifying love for the empire) which evokes loyalty for the existing government. Honestly

speaking the two sentiments are antagonistic, viz. loyalty to a foreign government and love for one's country, which is patriotism; unless the patriot is to reconcile his patriotism with loyalty by the idea that in loving the foreign ruler he loves his own country. It may be allowable to a patriot to soothe his conscience by identifying his loyalty with patriotism, but to carry it further and to extend it to the empire is coining a new expression with an entirely new meaning. When, therefore, in the name of the Empire, the British appeal to the patriotism of the Indians instead of to their loyalty, their object is to give a higher pedestal to the shame which every member of a subject race (having the least vestige of self-respect and honourable feeling in him) must feel at his political helplessness and at the political non-existence of his country. The object is to cover the shame of political bondage with the halo of glory that attaches to the word "patriotism" and thus to remove the sting that bites the consciences of those of the ruling race and puts to shame those among the ruled, as are still open to any sense of honour.

However commendable the motive and however praiseworthy the object may be, one does not require much common sense to see through the device. The fact is that human nature with all its inherent disposition towards selfishness is always apt to find excuses for its idiosyncracies and will not allow itself to be denied the pleasure of putting a gloss of high and pure motives on its basest and meanest acts, whereby it deprives others of the simplest rights of humanity and the priceless treasure of liberty. No wrong-doer, however educated and cultured he may be, can at times help feeling mortification at the wrongs which in the pursuit of self-interest he has inflicted or does inflict upon others, and it is then that his guilty conscience runs riot in search of pleas and justifications for his wrongful conduct. Makers and rulers of empires are no exception to this general rule, which governs human nature everywhere and in every phase of life. Now empires are neither made nor maintained by right. They are made by might, both physical and intellectual, including that diplomacy and cunning without which no supremacy can ever be gained over other peoples and nations. "Only by force can empire, as a rule, be created ; only by force can empire, as a rule, be maintained," rightly remarks Mr. Goddard in his excellent book on *Racial Supremacy*, although instances are not wanting in which wise and sagacious empire-makers and their equally clever

successors have maintained empires for a longer period than they otherwise could, by doses of benevolence and justice in the management of their affairs. But racial supremacy is one of those necessary evils of which the world can never be purged. Its roots are deep. No amount of philosophizing and high thinking will see its complete overthrow from the world, and as long as this necessary evil exists, which is tantamount to saying that it must always exist, you cannot do away with empires and empire-makers. Still that is no reason why those who are the victims of empires and empire-makers should feel grateful to their masters for having extended their empire over them and for having included them in the category of their subjects. As to the ethics of empire-making and as to the claims of the British to the gratitude of those included in their empire, we will prefer to quote some English authorities on the subject rather than give expression to our own views.

First, as to what does "empire" signify? In the language of Mr. J. G. Goddard, a member of the new House of Commons, it "simply means rule, dominion, sway." According to Lord Rosebery, empire is "the predominance of rule." According to Herbert Spencer "not the derivation of the word only but all its uses and associations imply the thought of predominance—imply a correlative subordination. Actual or potential coercion of other individuals or communities is necessarily involved in the conceptions." In the words of Mr. Goddard then "imperialism is the spirit of rule, ascendancy or predominance; the rule of one race of people by another race of people involving of course, the subjection of the former to the latter."

Mr. J. M. Robertson, another member of the House of Commons, also defines empire as "rule over other communities than his own." Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the jingo imperialist of modern England has, however, assured us that "the new conception of empire is of a voluntary organisation, based on community of interests and community of sacrifices, to which all should bring their contribution to the common good."

How far this is in accordance with existing facts has been made clear by Mr. Goddard in examining the above statement, in his book referred to above. In the opinion of this writer imperialism tends to demoralise the dominant race, while it is simply the bane

of the subject races. Taking the case of India as the most prominent and pertinent instance of the government of one people by another people, he concludes by saying that India is ruled in the interest of the dominant race rather than in hers and endorses the well known remarks of John Ruskin that "every mutiny, every danger, every crime occurring under our Indian legislation arose directly out of our native desire to live on the loot of India." The writer further condemns imperialism on the ground that it is destructive of liberty and applying it to the case of India he pronounces an indictment on imperialism in this country in the following terms :

"Here we have countless millions denied the rights accorded to the English agricultural labourer, taxed to pay for a Government in which they have no voice, condemned to support an army they cannot control, rack-rented for land they cultivate mainly for the benefit of others, compelled to yield interest on an expenditure they did not make, and generally reduced to the condition of hewers of wood and drawers of water, with sufferance as the badge of all their tribe".

Discussing the ethics of empire the same writer examines the claims of the dominant races in placing themselves in *quasi loco parentis* over subject races, as follows :

"The bond which unites father or mother with son and daughter is one of mutual affection and so far from self-sacrifice on the part of the dominant race being present, the opposite characteristic is manifested and there is certainly no constant endeavour to promote the welfare of the putative child. The most serious flaw in the analogy, however, has reference to the main purpose of control. For the primary object of the parental rule of children, is to develop their faculties, and that for their own benefit. It is a temporary and not a permanent rule, devoted to the purpose of rendering the child a self-governing person, capable as manhood is reached of exercising similar rule. The primary object of racial rule is not to develop the faculties of the governed; even if some development takes place, it is not for their own benefit; the rule is regarded not as temporary, but rather as permanent and it is not devoted to the purpose of rendering them capable of exercising similar rule. No doubt, in point of time, the infancy of man is incomparable to the infancy of a race,

and a far larger period is requisite for development. But a dominant nation does not work for or contemplate the abrogation of its power, even in the distant future; its rooted idea is that of its own supremacy; its constant aim is to secure the maintenance and generally the extension of that supremacy; its fundamental conception of the relations which exist is subjective and not objective. Hence, on almost all points the analogy is absolutely false and misleading. One, and one only, of the many parental functions is selected, and the rest are implicitly or explicitly ignored. The maturity of the parent and the immaturity of the child are at the outset assumed to respectively distinguish the two races; and then from a distorted simile an attempt is made to convert the temporary and qualified and specialised control which a parent exercises into a justification for the permanent and unqualified and general control which a nation claims.

Passing to the consideration of the second hypothesis of the imperialist, *viz*, that benevolence characterizes despotism, Mr. Goddard points out that in order to make despotism benevolent the one condition essential—that the power should be vested in one individual is wanting in the case. Thinking on the same line I have often wished that we had been ruled by Queen Victoria or by King Edward, or by any other single individual exercising the power of a despotic monarch rather than by the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland representing the British nation, for you can, at times, successfully appeal to the humanity and benevolence of individuals but to hope for justice and benevolence from a nation is hoping against hope. The rule of a foreign democracy is, in this respect, the most dangerous. The democracy is swayed by so many diverse interests and motives that it is simply impossible to expect anything like unanimity or even a preponderance of opinion in dealing justly with a subject race, because justice to a subject race often clashes or is inconsistent with the interest of some class of the ruling democracy. Whenever an attempt is, therefore, made to do justice to the former, the latter rise up, raise a storm and prevent the government from doing the right thing. Looking to the history of the cotton duties in India, every one will see the truth of my remarks. How many times have the Government of India been overruled in the matter, simply because the Home Government can not afford

to risk the opposition of Lancashire and incur its displeasure?[1]

As a matter of fact, we are at present ruled by a democracy which represents the British nation and in the appointing and controlling of which the Sovereign has really no hand. In my opinion the benevolence of a whole nation seems to be nothing more than a myth and a fiction, as there can never be an absolute unanimity both as to what constitutes benevolence in given circumstances, as well as to how it is to be reduced into practice. Applying the benevolence plea to the case of India and other subject races of Britain, Mr. Goddard concludes (a conclusion in which other eminent authorities agree) that the plea is simply untenable. Examining the idea of benevolence in imperial relations in the light of historical facts Mr. Goddard says, "The truth is that whilst it does not necessarily give rise to exalting acts of cruelty, so far from its ever being largely tempered by benevolence, it has invariably one prominent characteristic, namely, the exploitation of its victims. The primary object and result of alien government is not to confer benefits upon the subject races but to obtain benefits from them." He further says that:

"Perhaps......the most striking testimony to the virtues of benevolent despotism is seen in the employment of native races to fight our battles for us. Wild animals are sometimes lured to their doom by means of one of their kind trained to act as a decoy and we occasionally hear setting of a thief to catch a thief. The process has been adopted with a magnificent effrontery and a grim sense of humour to the needs of aggressive imperialism, and having extended the empire by bringing the "inferior races" under our sway, by a master stroke of genius, we utilise them to still further extend and also to defend the empire and convert them into instruments for bestowing upon their brethren the boons which they themselves have obtained. It is very largely in this way that our Indian Empire has been built up."

Then let us see what another English author, Mr. J A. Hobson says about the sophistries of imperialism. "The idea", he says, "that we are civilising India in the sense of assisting them to industrial, political, and moral progress along the lines either of our own or their civilisation is a complete delusion, based upon a false estimate of the influence of superficial changes brought by government and the activity of a minute group of aliens. The

delusion is only sustained by the sophistry of imperialism which weaves these fallacies to cover its nakedness and the advantages which certain interests suck out of empire," Even the late Professor Seeley writes in the same strain when he says: "We are not disposed to be proud of the succession of the Grand Moghul. We doubt whether with all the merits of our administration the subjects of it are happy. We may even doubt whether our rule is preparing them for a happier condition, whether it may not be sinking them lower in misery." But what Professor Seeley states in rather halting language is expressed affirmatively by another great writer on India, Mr. W.S. Lily. "The test of a people's prosperity", says Mr. Lily, "is not the extension of exports, the multiplication of manufactures or other industries, the construction of cities. No. A prosperous country is one in which the great mass of the inhabitants are able to procure with moderate toil what is necessary for living human lives, lives of frugal and assured comfort. Judged by this standard can India be called prosperous?" His answer, of course, is a positive 'No.' He adds that "comfort is a relative term and that in a tropical country like India the standard is very low......but millions of peasants in India are struggling to live on half an acre. Their existence is a constant struggle with starvation leading too often in defeat. Their difficulty is not to live human lives—lives up to the level of their poor standard of comfort—*but to live at all and not die.*"

Such then is the verdict of level-headed Englishmen on the result of imperial rule in India, which testimony is of hundred times greater value than the interested sayings of stock exchange brokers and speculators, whom the British System helps in hoarding up millions upon millions at the cost of the Indian peasant, the Indian labourer and the Indian handicraftsman. I could add the testimony of many more Englishmen as to the baneful effects of imperialism in India, but the fear of adding to the bulk of this part of the paper prevents me from doing so and I will conclude this part of the paper by adding one more quotation from the fascinating work of Mr. Goddard, wherein he shows how detrimental benevolent imperialism is to the interests of the subject races :

"The grevaman of the indictment of "benevolent despotism" is that it tends to perpetuate the despotism. Whilst in practice the benevolence, if manifested at all, is relatively small, and

whilst even if it were exhibited to the fullest extent circumstances admit, it would be no adequate justification; its supposed or actual existence obscures the facts, satisfies the conscience, and leads to acquiescence in the permanent withdrawal of liberty, instead of efforts towards its restoration."

It will be seen that in saying all this I have only discussed the general effects of imperial rule in India and have not even touched upon particular grievances. I have made no allusion to the brutal treatment we receive in South Africa, Australia and other parts of the empire, and I have made no mention of the disabilities from which we suffer in India. Is it then right to ask us to celebrate the Empire-day? Is it then likely to improve habits of sincerity and truthfulness amongst our boys, by compelling them to glorify the empire? Is it then honest on the part of our teachers and professors and directors to flatter us by saying that we are either the sons of the empire or its citizens, while we are neither, but are treated as the subjects of the empire—the victims of the imperial spirit that rules? Britishers may or may not glory in their empire. Perhaps from the ordinary point of view they have every reason to be proud of it and to glory in it. It tickles their fancy to think of their possessions, their dependencies and their subjects, though the sober-minded amongst them have begun to talk loudly as to the evil effects of imperialism on the morale of their own people. The once sturdy and vigorous, both in thought and in deed, the simple but the highminded, the reserved but solid Britisher is perhaps exchanging his virtues for the comforts, ease and luxuries, which attend an unchecked sway of empire and the bumptiousness and the vulgar pride of unbounded intoxication of uncontrolled power. Be however as it may, we do not and we cannot object to the Britisher at home or in India celebrating his Empire-day, but it is nothing short of adding insult to injury to ask us and our boys to do so. Devoted patriots, as the British are, is it fair on their part to ask us to celebrate the Empire-day in the name of "Patriotism towards the Empire"—a patriotism which we do not feel, which does not inspire us with noble thoughts and which evokes neither love nor homage in our bosoms? As helpless victims of the aggressive imperialism, as servants of the Crown and as students

of schools and colleges, we might silently put up with humiliation, but I dare say I am not wrong in reading the hearts of the bulk of my educated countrymen when I say, that the idea is simply revolting and extremely provoking to their sense of honour and shame. Those Britishers and Indians who thus trade in hypocrisy, and who thus would inoculate the minds of the innocent boys and girls with the serum of hypocrisy are doing a positive injury to human nature, and to the principles of sound education without doing any good to the British rule in India. In the name of loyalty we are prepared to submit to any order which the authorities issue, but we earnestly beg of them not to drag our patriotism into the mire and not to force us to compromise the same. The demands of patriotism are sacred and ennobling, which require no hypocrisy, and which evoke the deepest feelings of love for our country and for our people.

15. POLITICAL WORK IN THE PUNJAB

It is a matter of very great satisfaction that our Ambala friends should have given us an opportunity of coming together and conferring on certain public questions of the day which so vitally affect the future of our country including the little province which we call our own. For this our best thanks are due to the organisers of this conference, most prominent of whom are Rai Sahib Murli Dhar, Pandit Madho Ram, Babu Hari Nath Mukerjee and Mr. Alakh Dhari. It may not, however, be altogether out of place to mention here that almost at the same time when our Ambala friends were resolving to organize this conference I had sent a letter to the press proposing a small informal conference of a limited number of friends interested in political questions to consider and discuss some of the matters which are now included in the programme of this gathering. A proof of that letter was sent for the perusal of Rai Sahib Murli Dhar and Pandit Madho Ram. However, the moment I learnt of the proposal for holding the conference at Ambala, I abandoned the idea of issuing my letter in the hope that the conference might afford the opportunity of gaining the object aimed at by my letter. It is my desire in this paper to review our position in this province in the matter of political work and to make suggestions, for your consideration, in order to improve the existing order of things, if possible. First to begin with the agency for work.

AGENCY FOR POLITICAL WORK

It must be frankly admitted that so far the Punjabees have shown very little aptitude for political work. The Indian Association of Lahore has been in existence for over twenty-five years[1] but if we were to examine its achievements I am afraid we won't find

Lala Lajpat Rai's speech at the Punjab Political Conference. Reproduced from *The Panjabee* of 10 October and 13 October 1906.

much to congratulate ourselves upon. For some years, in its early history, it did a lot of useful work in carrying on an agitation to prevent the then Panjab University College being incorporated as a purely Oriental University under the scheme put forward and pressed by the late Dr. Leitner. Fortunately for the Punjab the formal legislative incorporation of the University happened to be undertaken in the time of a liberal Viceroy like Lord Ripon with an equally liberal Lieutenant-Governor like Sir Charles Aitchison and the Punjab was saved from what would have been nothing short of a disaster to the educational progress of the province.[2] These were those good old days when the present ill-feeling between the Hindus and the Mohamedans had not been started and when no less a person than Sir Syed Ahmed Khan himself considered it an honour to speak under the auspices of the Indian Association calling the Hindus and Mohamedans the two pupils of his eyes. For a number of years afterwards, thanks to the energy, partriotism and zeal of Babu J. C. Bose, the Association continued to show some activity in the shape of submitting memorials to Government and giving addresses of welcome and farewell to coming and departing Lieutenant-Governors. Its financial burdens were chiefly borne by the late lamented Sardar Dyal Singh whose generosity evidently made the other members free of the duty of paying their subscriptions to the Association. This left the members of the Association to a group of men without any real stake in its affairs and without any inducement to show real zeal in looking after the same. In the meantime other causes had also sprung up which combined to lessen the influence of the Indian Association. The Association had been taking great interest in matters educational. In fact that was its chief work which appealed to the people. But since the Aligarh party of Mohamedans concentrated their attention and energies on the Aligarh College and the Arya Samaj on the D.A.V. College, the Association was deprived of that important hold on public mind and gradually lost in importance. The educational work of the Arya Samaj, supported by a very large section of the best energy, intellect and public spirit of the Province monopolised all public attention for some time until the division of the Samaj into two parties again diverted the attention of the people to matters other than religious, social and educational.

The matters were in this pass when Babu Jogendra Chandra Bose and Rai Sahib Murli Dhar, in whose persons alone the political activity of this province was chiefly centred, got a valuable ally in the person of the late lamented Bakshi Jaishi Ram. The success of the last Punjab Congress, the one held in 1893, was chiefly due to these gentlemen. At the time when the Congress was first invited to Lahore the balance sheet of the Indian Association showed a lamentable state of things and the arrears of subscriptions were simply fabulous. The Congress of 1893 was, however, with all its shortcomings an unqualified success, though it was followed by an almost death-like lull. The only matter of political interest for several years was the question of the annual contribution to the British Committee of the Congress which always elicited a lively discussion. This was the period of the growth of the industrial movement which has ever since absorbed the little diversion that was created by the split in the Arya Samaj. The industrial movement opened the eyes of the people to the money-value of the time which they could spare from their official or professional engagements. The leading Arya Samajists had always been known to be averse to political activity of the kind of the Congress though some of them attended the annual meetings now and then, Bakshi Jaishi Ram alone never missing any. The aversion of the leading Arya Samajists to political activity was to a great extent shared by those non-Arya Samajists who took the lead in the industrial movement. It was this double aversion which was to a great extent responsible for the absence of any agitation worth its name, on such retrogressive measures as the Punjab Land Alienation Act and the subsequent separation of the Frontier Districts from the Punjab.[3] Both these measures were adopted in the face of the opposition of the then head of the Punjab Government[4] as well as of the opinion of a very influential section of the Punjab Civilians. During this period we have had a meeting of the Congress in the Punjab but beyond this we have hardly shown any interest in political matters. The country at large has, in the meanwhile, thanks to the genius of Lord Curzon, practically undergone a great change and is at the present moment almost in the throes of a revolution (at least so far as Bengal is concerned).

The first question then that I wish to put to the educated

community of the Punjab is, if in their opinion the time has not come when we ought to pay greater attention to the political affairs of the country? Are we or are we not fit or ready for any sort of political activity or shall we wait more? I will not attempt to answer these questions for you. But I may be permitted to say this much that an answer in the affirmation implies a further question which to my mind is of still greater importance than the one already stated. What do politics signify for us? Does it simply mean responding to the annual call of the Congress to send delegates or is it for concessions and reforms which the Government is not prepared to concede—not that in their heart of hearts they do not believe in the soundness of the reforms asked for or in the justice of our claims but because they know that the demand for reforms is not backed by any compelling capacity to enforce the same. Are we, then, to continue to move in the old groove, go down on our knees only to be repulsed with contempt or are we prepared to make a departure and try to create real political environments amongst us which may eventually train us for a true political life? If you decide for the first alternative then I do not consider that there is much occasion for regretting our past indiffernce in matters political. This decision will be tantamount to a confession that we are not yet fit or ready for any political movement in our province. If so let us understand it clearly and give up all the befooling that has for some time been going on in appeals for political activity in this province. Let us not dictate constitutions to other people who, perhaps, know better what to attempt and what not to attempt. In this case we can either quietly sit at home as before or be peaceful spectators of what others do. If, however, you declare your mind in favour of the second alternative then also I must ask you to clearly realise the responsibility involved therein. Real, earnest political work, pardon me for using a vulgar expression, is no tomfoolery. It is not child's play but a very expensive and risky game. Those who enter the lists must be prepared for all sorts of sacrifices. They should expect no quarters (not to speak of favours) from the Government or its officials, even if they attempt nothing which is either illegal or outrageous. If ever in the past they have been blessed with the smiles of the Feringhee or aspired to honours at his hands they should once for all close that chapter of their

life before opening the first page of the new. They must be prepared to vote at least a decent fraction of their incomes for the cause. They must not also grudge to set apart some time for the study of various problems that come to the front in the course of the work. In short, they should be as serious about it, if not more, as about the other activities of their life in which at the present moment they find themselves engaged.

A true political movement worth its name cannot be carried on without men nor without funds. If every minute of the time of those people engaged in political work has so much money-value, which they cannot forego in favour of political work, then we must find out other men to work up the movement who have and can afford to give time to it. Moreover, we must also be prepared to find funds for the same. To make an humble start we require at least Rs. 2,400 per annum, that is, Rs. 200 per mensem. If we cannot afford to find Rs. 200 per mensem for political work in this province we may safely conclude that the times are not yet ripe for any political activity here. Just think of a people putting forth claims for liberal political institutions and pleading inability to spend Rs. 200 per mensem for the cause. Then there must also be people who can find time to devote to the study of political literature and to go into the different phases of political questions. There is no use of indulging in generalities, the bearing of which on the questions in hand is at times not understood by the various speakers themselves. The speeches on political questions should not merely be an issue of common place platitudes ending with an appeal to the emotions but should throw ample light on the different aspects of the question in hand which cannot be expected of speakers who have had neither time nor inclination to study the literature on the subject. Second-hand quotations or references are often misleading. What I mean is that there should be made an honest, earnest attempt to study, understand and grasp political questions in a practical spirit. There should also be some real thinking which may be followed by sincere and earnest action. Unfortunately what I understand from politics in this country, as already hinted, is a little bit different from what others think. Generally politics in this country are identified with agitation against Government, the demand of certain concessions by means of certain memorials and resolutions and so on.

This may be political work but what is of greater importance still is the raising of the people both intellectually, and morally, awakening them to a consciousness of their importance and their capabilities and last but not the least of identifying our existence with them. I lay great stress upon the last. In order to be the rightful leaders of the people the educated community must strive to serve the latter selflessly and faithfully. The people must come to realise in the course of time that the national leaders care for them to a greater extent than the Government officials do and that in all their troubles and difficulties they can look to them more effectively than to the Government. The task is, no doubt, very difficult, one may say herculean. The great resources of the Government and the abilities and general integrity of their agents meet you at almost every step but considering that the Government is foreign and in its policy is often guided by the interests of its own countrymen rather than by those of the people of this country and that its superior agents are also foreigners who do not know the sentiments of the people and do not care to win over their affections, the task of the educated leaders may not be so difficult as it looks to be. Where the Government may fail with its millions the educated leaders may succeed with a few thousands. The real key to the situation then lies in selfless service of the people. The country stands in need of a party of patriots whose sole business should be to go about amongst the people to enlighten them, to study their wants, and to try to remove the same. Till such men are found, let us try to make a start in our own humble way. Coming to actual suggestions for a political organisation in this province I would suggest:

(a) That the Indian Association of Lahore should be maintained and strengthened by the addition of new members and that District Associations may, if possible, be established all over the province; (b) that a separate political Council be established to study political questions, collect information and collate the latter before any action is to be recommended to the larger and more representative body, the Indian Association. This Council should have a paid agency at its disposal and should maintain an office. This Council should be composed of a few men only, every one of whom may be required to pay at least Rs. 50 as admission fee and Rs. 100 as annual subscription. If necessary, some (though

very few) may be exempted from the operation of this rule and admitted as honorary members. You will pardon me, gentlemen, for saying that if the whole of the Punjab cannot supply twenty men for the membership of this Council then we may better wait for better times and conclude that we are not yet sufficiently earnest about a political organization in this province.

LINES OF WORK

As to the lines of work I think we might with advantage study the situation in Bengal. To me it looks as if our brothers in Bengal (both of the so-called old school and of the new school) have opened an effective chapter in the future political history of this great country. Only a year before, they were the most Europeanized of all the races that were to be found in India; they did not know what *Swadesh Vastu* was, their political work chiefly consisted of speeches, resolutions and memorials; and their great ambition was to lead an easy life. They cared neither for organisation nor for constitution. The leaders and the led were both self-contained.

The troubles of the masses moved them only rarely. Famines after famines desoluted the country; the earthquake made a great havoc in this province early last year, but the Bengalee leaders hardly moved their little finger to relieve the sufferings of the affected and the distressed. They spent their force in calling upon the Government to do this and to do that and hurled their anathemas against the foreign bureaucracy which monopolized all the good things of the world and did not give a share of the same to them. This time last year, however, a movement was started in Bengal which has since then simply changed the face of the country. Our venerable leader, the revered Editor of the *Indian Mirror*, is greatly concerned at the spirit of unrest that just now prevails in Bengal as the result of this activity. He is deeply affected by the disturbances caused by strikes and similar other events and utters a sincere cry for peace. His spiritual balance of mind has been upset by the prospects of an assured peace for ever disappearing from before his holy vision. His good soul longing for *Nirvana* cannot tolerate these quarrels for higher wages on the part of labouring classes as these disputes have led to some trifling disturbances in his beloved province. Mr. Narendra Nath Sen is a

man of deep religious trend of mind. I have known him for long and have always admired him for his sincerity of convictions and simplicity of life. He is sincerely disturbed as his ideals are mostly spiritual and he seems to care little for the affairs of this mundane world. But he forgets that a people politically enslaved can have no peace. Even if the people were inclined to accept a foreign domination for ever there are other earth-grabbers and military adventurers with high imperial ambitions (nine hundred and nine) which will not let them have peace under their present rulers even though foreign. What guarantee can there be that the future will produce no Alexanders, Abdul Qasims, Tamerlanes, Chengez Khans, Nadirs, Ahmad Shahs, Dupleixes and Clives. A nation which once loses its political independence can have no rest or peace except, perhaps, under a wholesale *Nirvana*. Unless, therefore, we are prepared for a national *Nirvana* there can be no peace for us. Unless, therefore, we once for all determine to be and to remain for ever the beasts of burden as we just now are there can be no peace in this country. Every step to advance means unrest, some loss of peace, some disturbance of the existing order of things. What is progress if not *Ashanti* (unrest) writ in big, broad, unmistakable characters. If, then, my country-men you are actuated by a desire for progress, be it religious, social or political you must pass through a hell of *Ashanti*. The road to heaven unfortunately lies through a labyrinth of hells. You must pass through the latter before you can reach the former. The Almighty has ordained so. Mother nature has also said the same. Why the heavenly in man is also surrounded and hedged in by everything hellish. Incredibly bold and audacious must be the man who aspires to reach the heaven without passing through, crossing or overcoming the hell. So it is of no use to be afraid of the loss of peace. Danger of loss of peace is no test of the viciousness of a forward movement, nor should it stand in our way. Let us look for other reasons to see if the movement that has changed the face of Bengal within the last twelve months; that has converted the average self-satisfied self-contained Bengalee into a true patriot placing the good of his fellow countrymen before that of his own self; that has made the so-called timid Bengalee seek for occasions of risk and danger; that has drawn out of their shell of retirement, retired High Court Judges and eminent lawyers to lay the foundations of a National

Seminary for education;[5] that has transformed talkers into actors and boys into martyrs; and last but not the least that has made the hitherto superbly haughty European bureaucrat tremble in his chair of safety, is sound? Let us examine this new movement which has given so much vitality to Bengal, from points of view other than those of peace or no peace. If the movement is otherwise sound, good and righteous, peace or no peace, we must follow it and consecrate our lives to it. If on examination it is found to be unsound, vicious and unrighteous we may safely keep aloof from it. If it is defective we may remove its defects and adopt it with necessary modifications. Be what it may, one thing is certain that nobody, not even the mighty bureaucracy that rules this country,[7] can ignore the new movement and kill it by ridicule and contempt. It is a legitimate sequel of Lord Curzon's defiant attitude towards the sons of the soil.

The administration of Lord Curzon, his repressive and retrograde legislation, his defiance of public opinion, led the people to conclude that purely paper agitation on the part of a class of Indians who, on account of their education, considered and still consider themselves to be the natural leaders of the people, is utterly futile in influencing the decisions of the Government. They saw that notwithstanding a continuous paper and lip agitation for the last twenty years the Government had gradually withdrawn or nullified every privilege that had been granted to them by the Government of Lord Ripon. Local self-Government has been made a farce by the officializing of the local bodies, education has been centralized in the hands of the Government Educational Department, competitive examinations for entry into the public service have either been abolished or curtailed, the Universities have been placed under official censorship ; in fact the one sole object of Lord Curzon's policy has been to shut all sources of public activity to the sons of the soil, where the latter could possibly learn lessons of self-help and self-reliance and receive the necessary training for the government of their country by themselves.

Under these circumstances the leaders in Bengal concluded and rightly concluded that it was high time to turn to the people, the real source of all political power. They had hitherto looked to the Government to grant them democratic institutions evidently forgetting that the latter must be made by the democracy itself. Democratic

institutions signify a government of the democracy by the democracy itself. Those who want this must have *a fortiori* look to the democracy and not to the powers that are interested in keeping the latter down. It was no wonder, then, that the ruling class looked with contempt upon those who could talk glibly but did not evidently understand the alphabet of democratic movements. Their claims to represent the people were consequently scouted and their resolutions thrown into the waste paper basket. The claims of the educated classes, to speak in the name of the masses because the former were the natural leaders of the latter were simply scoffed at because these so called leaders never cared to approach those whom they professed to lead. Thank God ! the mistake, eventually, went home and the Bengal leaders realised the force of the same. Having done so they initiated the policy of passive resistance and for the first time, during British rule, they took the people into their confidence and attempted both to teach and lead them. This attempt has been wonderfully successful and the success of Bengal has shown to the people of other provinces that what has been done and done successfully there, can be and should be done now or hereafter in other parts of India as well. It pains us that at the present moment the leaders in Bengal should be fighting amongst themselves over a matter which does not seem to be of such a great importance as is attached to it. Is it really such a question of life and death that efforts should be made to keep back Mr. Tilak from the Presidentship of the next Congress or that the other party should stake every thing on it ?[6] I think not. Is then the struggle in the Bengal amongst the leaders meaningless ? Again I must answer the question in the negative. The real and vital question at issue seems to be whether the call to democracy, which has been so successfully made during the last twelve months, ought to be continued or given up at the first show of a trivial surrender by the Government. If the old leaders for whom we have the greatest respect really mean to give up the call to democracy and again begin to call on the Government to give them this and to give them that, then I am afraid they are grievously mistaken. Why should they assume that Mr. Morley can do for them what only the democracy can do for itself ? Let it be understood once for all by all concerned that democratic institutions are never conceded by governments (not democratic) but won by democracies for themselves. If this conclusion be correct then it is,

perhaps, futile to argue whether we want autonomy in a colonial form of government or complete independence. In due course the democracy shall have what it is fit for. The only thing to be insisted upon and never to be lost sight of is that if democratic institutions are desired, the appeal should primarily be made to the democracy. It is the latter which should be principally worked upon and not the government. That is at least what Mr. Morley's writings teach us and if that teaching is right our course is straight and we need not turn from it even if Mr. Morley wishes us to do. The Swadeshi and the boycott in Bengal have raised the people to a consciousness of their power, they have taught them the uses of combination and for once in the history of British India the industrial and the wage earning classes in this country seem to be realizing that their destiny and their bread is in their own hands and not in the hands of those handful of people who lord over them. The secret of this new movement is that educated people, well-versed in the methods of democratic agitation have condescended to throw themselves amongst the people, to enlighten them on their rights and duties and to influence them for good. These last twelve months have actually worked wonders in Bengal. Where 100 years' lip-agitation and paper-agitation failed these six months or twelve months' right work has succeeded. Let nobody misunderstand the real situation. It is the state of affairs in Bengal that is influencing Mr. Morley or strengthening his hands to induce the British democracy to make some concessions to the people of India. In my opinion the new movement materially strengthened the hands of Mr. Gokhale in his late mission to England. But for the new movement Mr. Gokhale might not have received as much attention as he is believed to have secured at the hands of the authorities in England. The present political unrest in India is due to this new movement of self-help and self-reliance which bids fair to inaugurate an era of effective passive resistance. I am sorry that the new party, called the party of Extremists in Bengal, should have allowed the real truth to be clouded even for a time by the comparatively paltry question of who should be the President of the next Congress or by the occasional use of rather extravagant language which cannot certainly be justified by the existing condition of things in the country. In my humble opinion, the new movement does not require the so-called exposure of the old leaders nor does it require the use of that extravagant language to

which objection is being taken by the old leaders. If the old leaders fail to go with the times, their leadership itself may be in danger. If, however, they are prepared to rise equal to the occasion then there would be no occasion for regret. The party of action need neither curse nor bless. Theirs should be the mission to raise the democracy to a sense of their importance and their duty. It matters little who presides at the next Congress so long as the party of action realise their duty and are resolved to continue their work irrespective of the smiles or frowns of both friends and foes. We have a very high opinion of the leaders be they of the so-called old School or the new. As to the lines of work it seems that the whole country must be unanimous about the desirability of acting on the lines of self-help and self-reliance. It is habit (which is often second nature) which now and again sways the leaders of the country not to give up the old methods of work altogether and go at a slow pace. I am a believer in evolution and it is my firm conviction that a few disappointments more and everyone will recognise the futility or at least the insufficiency of what is called the begging policy. Even revolutions are the products of the process of evolution. The political upheaval in Bengal has been rather sudden and it is this suddenness which stuns both the friends and foes. So long as the country is led by honest and sincere men I have no doubt that sooner or later all of them will come to realize that liberty was never conceded but won. By themselves are nations made is a truth eternal and for all times and for all people and it cannot be otherwise for us. What we want of our leaders is to set themselves earnestly to the task of preparing the democracy for the coming struggle. I hope I am not betraying any confidence in saying that in Mr. Gokhale's opinion too, 9/10th of our work lies in India and 1/10 in England. If so let us attend to this 9/10 earnestly. The question of continuing the Congress on the old lines or introducing changes in it is only one of time and procedure. The object is one and indivisible, *viz.*, to unite and win our liberty. Some difference of opinion is bound to exist with regard to it. It has been so in all countries. Let us read history with profit and try to avoid magnifying these differences by adopting an acrimonious attitude towards each other. Everyone of us has our failings whether he belongs to the old school of thought or the new. The "old" leaders (I use the word "old" only to avoid any misunderstanding) are entitled to our best thanks, for all that they

did, according to their own light, at a time when, perhaps, nothing else could be attempted. They are naturally loth to give up old methods altogether and want to proceed very cautiously. I do not think anyone need ascribe motives to them for this. So far as we in the Punjab are concerned we feel real and sincere respect both for Mr. Gokhale and Mr. Tilak. We admire the work of both Babu Surendra Nath Banerji as well as that of Babu Bepin Chandra Pal. We are also grateful to Messrs. Mehta, Wacha and others for all that they have been doing and are doing in the interests of their country according to their own light. We Indians just now are not in a position to quarrel with each other and start acrimonious controversies. I know that at times the temptation is too great to be avoided even by the soberest and the most moderate of men, to use strong language as well as to indulge in strong criticisms. Even Mr. Naoroji cannot help doing so at times. But as amongst ourselves I would prefer a more harmonious and compromising spirit of co-operation than may, perhaps, be justified by strict adherence to theoretical principles. In my humble opinion it is a question of *modus operandi.* There can be absolutely no harm in having recourse to expediency in *modus operandi.* But then I see no reason why people should be so thin skinned as to resent the slightest criticism or to convert differences of opinion on matters of principle into personal enmities. I would appeal to my countrymen outside Bengal to avoid taking sides in this controversy. The controversy as to principles is harmless, nay perhaps desirable. The controversy as to men should, as far as possible, be avoided. Nor do I think is it necessary to lay down any hard and fast rules as to what shall be our attitude towards the Government. That it must be one of *legal* loyalty is granted on all hands. That we should give up praying to Government for all times to come need not be laid down as a rule. Everything will depend upon the attitude of the authorities to the altered condition of the times. There is only one thing about which we should be very particular, *viz.*, not to discontinue our work in the masses. If we are true to our determination to educate the masses, to win their affection and attachment ; in short, if we remain *loyal to our* own people we have nothing to conceal, nothing to be afraid of. For God's sake let us not fritter away our energies in mutual recriminations and in high sounding words. As to the presidentship of the next Congress I for my part see no

reason why the old leaders should be so suspicious of Mr. Tilak. Do they really believe him so devoid of common sense as to turn everything topsy-turvy if he is elected as president. If, on the other hand, his election is not desired by a majority of the Reception Committee why is not the matter put to a vote and set at rest. The decision of the majority should bind all. If it is decided to invite Mr. Naoroji the whole country will receive the decision with acclamation. In any case, whoever is selected by a majority of the Reception Committee should be accepted with good grace by all concerned. A word more on the relations of Hindus and Mahomedans and I have done. It is my firm conviction that Hindus shall never cease to be Hindus and Mahomedans shall never cease to be Mahomedans. Their religious ideals are so different that it is impossible to expect a complete social union of them in the near future. But that is no reason why they cannot make common cause in political work. Against non-Indians they have common grievances. In the political future of the country both are equally interested. When the foreigner insults an Indian or treats him with contempt he hardly stops to enquire if the object of his attack is a Hindu or a Mahomedan. When the Europeans want a monopoly of certain high offices in the State they make no exceptions in favour of Mahomedans. Why can't we then stand shoulder to shoulder on the political platform? The press and the Public men in this country hardly ever make any distinction between Hindus ond Mahomedans when ventilating political grievances or when bringing to light individual cases of oppression. It is no business of any political association to enquire if the sufferer is a Hindu or a Mahomedan. Every public man in the country should consider it his duty to expose official injustice, high-handedness and oppression irrespective of the religion of the victim. Let us then take to work honestly, sincerely and earnestly, my brethren, with a faith in God and in the righteousness of our cause and with a determination to win at any cost.

16. THE NATIONAL OUTLOOK : GREAT NEED OF THE SITUATION

PROBLEMS OF the gravest import await our solution—"problems which need all our nerve, all our determination, all our courage, all our hope and which affect the life and death of us all," were the words uttered by one of the most popular divines of England, portraying "national perils" for the consideration of his countrymen. Well did he say that the conditions of things then or at any time may be looked at in two different ways. There is one set of facts, which, when considered exclusively, would make us hopeless pessimists. There is another set of facts which when taken by themselves may furnish good ground for the most sanguine optimism.

The truth, however, generally lies between the two. While pessimism is positively harmful as dispiriting and discouraging, optimism may be misleading as tending to produce a frame of mind which is always sanguine, prone to ignore difficulties and to neglect very necessary precautions. The best and the safest course, therefore, will be to steer clear of extreme views, to weigh the situation as accurately as may be possible in the light of our own history, that of the ruling race, and that of other countries and people similarly situated. Practical wisdom lies in eschewing, over-estimating as well as under-estimating. While it is no good under-estimating our difficulties and over-estimating our capacities, it is perhaps more harmful to have a very low opinion of ourselves and our people. Both are equally bad ; though if compelled to make a choice between the two, I would rather choose the former than the latter. Keeping the past history of the Hindus in mind I would rather see them indulge in optimism than in pessimism.

Originally published in the *Modern Review*, volume I, (1907), pp. 282-89.

We have so long been in doubt about ourselves, about the world and about the good in the world that it is time to exchange this latter attitude of mind for confidence in self, confidence in our people, and hope for a better future, which may give us better opportunities to use and enjoy the good and the beautiful in the world. We have known enough of misery and it is time we made up our minds to discard it at any cost, even at the risk of having to suffer and undergo greater misery in the attempt to achieve the desired end.

But while recommending this attitude of mind to the nation at large, I cannot help asking those engaged in the work of awakening the people to a sense of their rights, to make no attempts to under-estimate the difficulties or to ignore them. I know there are a number of people ill-disposed towards us, who exaggerate our difficulties so that we may sink under their weight and give up all efforts to rise. These honourable gentlemen, past masters in the art of diplomacy as they are, leave no stone unturned to make us and our people believe that there is no hope for us ; that it is perfectly futile for us to make any attempt to gain our liberty ; that, in fact, we are happier now than we can possibly be in a state of self-government. While they do not scruple to threaten us with fire and sword now and then, at other times they are disposed to use the milder weapon of persuasion, trying each in turn and hopeful of favourable results. While constantly dinning into our ears the vastness of the resources of their empire, more than sufficient in their opinion to bring down the whole of Asia to their feet, they never forget to remind us of our shortcomings and failings and weaknesses—our state of disunion and our helplessness in their grip. While some of us they theaten, others they cajole and flatter, going even so far as to bribe some, who are susceptible of being won over in that way. Our wisdom, moderation, prudence, and humanity are all, in turns appealed to, nay, our patriotism also is requisitioned at times on their side. All our weak points are assailed and a superhuman effort is being made to persuade us to give up all efforts to win self-government, the latter being at times painted as very pernicious, injurious and harmful, in the case of Asiatic peoples. Oh, how shocking must it be to those who believe in the innate sense of goodness and justice of human nature and in the native integrity of human conscience ! But self-interest blinds a man and

it is no wonder, that blinded by self-interest, carried away by the lust of gain and power, these imperial wolves in the shape of men, should belie their innate good natures and in the degradation of their own souls try to bring down even truth and uprightness. One is at times disposed to lose all faith in the goodness of human nature when one sees these *professed friends* of ours preaching sermons of unswerving loyalty, and forbearance and moderation to us in their efforts to make us believe that our state of complete subservience is nothing but perfect bliss for us, and that an attempt to throw it off is sinful and likely to land us in greater disasters. I will advise my people to decline to listen to these friends of ours, if they desire to go forward and to attach no weight whatsoever either to their threats or their promises or their reasoning but all the same, to try to study the situation well, find out the truth and do what is right and just, be the consequences what they may. At the 22nd session of the Indian National Congress our worthy president, the grand old man of India, has laid down our political goal. The aim of all our efforts and the object of all our agitation, has been placed before us in clear, unambiguous and unmistakable terms. In a happy and inspired moment Mr. Naoroji struck upon that noble word—"Swaraj", which sums up all our political aspirations. Henceforth, "Swaraj" is our war-cry, our all-inspiring and all-absorbing aim in life. Henceforth, the duty of our earthly existence should be to forget self in this aim prescribed for us by the exigencies of the times and accepted by us after consideration of all the pros and cons.

For the first time in the history of political agitation in this country under British rule, the goal of all our political effort has been so clearly laid down before us ; and thank God that for that we are indebted to no other but one who is the flesh of our flesh and the bone of our bone—a chip of the old block. We are now no longer groping in the dark as to the final goal of our political ambition ; Swaraj has now been, officially, so to say, and definitely set up as the polestar in the firmament of Indian nationalism, and there it shall stay and shine with ever-resplendent glory and splendour as the guiding star of our hopes and aspirations. So far well and good. The next question that now arises is how to reach that goal and how to realise that aim ? Like practical men, who have every desire to go into the matter in a businesslike spirit, we

should first of all make a complete survey of the difficulties in the way of our success and then take stock of our resources, so that we might successfully employ the latter to meet the former. Coming to our difficulties, in my opinion the foremost place amongst them must be given to our want of faith in ourselves, to the scepticism that is the ruling doctrine of our life, to the habit of too close an analysis which paralyses both action and thought.

Unfortunately, for us, though born in a country dominated by a religious atmosphere of great depth all round, we are wanting in "that power of faith and will which neither counts obstacles nor measures time." At present, we are nothing more than a set of doubting Thomases fond of analysis and entirely devoid of synthesis. Perhaps we are getting into a habit of destroying rather than that of building. We can calculate profits and losses to annas and pies, but we are devoid of that spirit of enterprise which can dare and at time play boldly. In a country whose history is brimful of instances of thousands of men and women having willingly and gladly sacrificed their all for the sake of honour and faith, we find that a century of Western domination has so changed the ruling impulses of life as to convert the people into a set of clay-puppets having no will or faith of their own. Thank God, the country has not lost all sense of spirituality. The gold is there. It requires the touch of a magician to find it out and to make it over to them whose it is by birthright. The true solution of the problem lies in appealing to the true instincts and tendencies of the Indian heart, mute just now, but revealed to us in the pages of our history. In the words of Mazzini, the first step towards this aim is "to make war against the existing idolatry of material interests and substitute for it the worship of the just and the true : and to convince the [Indians] that their sole path to reality is through sacrifice—constancy in sacrifice. The work before us is not only an endeavour to create a united nation but to make her great and powerful—worthy of her past glories and conscious of her future mission."

India is just now materialistic, believing in the benevolence of English Ministers or English Parliaments, seeking rather the amelioration of the condition of the classes than to constitute itself a nation. The country and its leaders rather fight shy of high principles, and are ready to accept any compromise, any offer of a post here or there, any tinkering with their rights, any mode of

assistance and last but not the least "always ready to accept any man brought forward with a promise of relieving her immediate sufferings" as their *Messiah.* Our attitude towards the questions of the day is not determined by its inherent righteousness, but by the chance of its reception at the hands of the powers that be. We are not always actuated by truth and justice, but by expediency and tactics. Our object is to propitiate our foreign rulers, but not to inspire our people. We choose to live in a world of myth and fiction and not in a world of truth, faith and duty. We conceal our sentiments not because they are not true and just but because we cannot afford to offend those whom they might hurt. In trying to deceive others we often deceive ourselves. The result is that we are lacking in that power of faith which alone can make us men, able to create a nation and win liberty for the same.

Our morta disease is that unlimited confidence in every thing bearing the outward semblance of all calculation and tactics, that constant distrust of all enthusiasm, energy and simultaneous action—three things which sum up the whole science of revolution. We wait, study and follow circumstances ; we neither seek to dominate nor to create them. We honour with the name of prudence that which is, in action, merely mediocrity of intellect.

Our whole life from top to bottom smacks of fear, dreadly fear of losing in the estimation of those whom we in our heart of hearts believe to be only usurpers : fear of losing the sunshine of the smile of those whom we believe to be day and night engaged in the exploitation of our country and the spoliation of our people, fear of offending the false gods that have by fraud or force taken possession of our bodies and souls, fear of being shut up in a dungeon or prison house, as if the freedom that we enjoy, is not by its own nature, one to be abhorred, despised and hated,—a freedom by default or by sufferance. In my opinion the problem before us is in the main a religious problem—religious not in the sense of doctrines and dogmas—but religious in so far as to evoke the highest devotion and the greatest sacrifice from us. Our first want, then, is to raise our patriotism to the level of religion and to aspire to live or to die for it. We believe in religion for the sake of the truth in it which is to secure for our souls communion with God. There in the presence of our God we forget our tiny selves, the pettiness of our minds and rising above the same, drink from the pure fountain

of bliss and love. In the same way, let the edifice of patriotism be raised on the solid rock of truth and justice. In worshipping truth and justice let us be honest and bold, regardless of worldly losses and gains. Let the people first learn to think honestly and boldly. This will in course of time be followed by honest, bold and truthful words and the latter by honest, bold and inspiring deeds.

If we do this, the future of our country is in our hands. There is no power on earth that can stand between us and our country as there is no petty god that can ever come between the conscience of an honest, bold worshipper and his Almighty Maker. The first step of the political ladder, then, consists in our educating the people in a school of true politics, of our initiating them into a religion of true patriotism with a creed of Nationality, Liberty and Unity, to be believed and striven after with all the sincerity of heart and devotion, worthy of the oriental mind. Let us first renounce all kinds of self-interest and class-interest, in favour of a noble and universal patriotism embracing all the people and all the provinces of Mother India, irrespective of creed, caste and colour. All talk of unity is futile unless we succeed in bringing about a unity of purpose in the minds of the people whom we desire to unite. An attempt to base this unity of purpose on material interests might lead us in interminable dissensions and endless controversies—in insuperable friction and unsurmountable irritation. But a sincere effort to give a higher and spiritual basis to our unity of purpose might save the situation and lead us safely to the haven of our hopes. That oneness of purpose is very happily summed up in the sacred salutation *Bande Mataram* and in the war-cry of 'Swaraj.'

Let us next proceed to examine the forces that are likely to oppose us in our propaganda. Here, again, the greatest danger is, in my opinion, from within and not from without.

To the Government there are only two paths that are open—a system of terror or a system of concessions. The latter possesses more possibilities of success than the former. A system of terror invariably recoils over the heads of those that resort to it, and I am confident that the British are sufficiently wise not to forget that there is a great deal of truth in what is so often quoted by European revolutionists that :—

"Blood calls for blood, and the dagger of conspirator is never

so terrible as when sharpened on the tomb-stone of a martyr."

A system of small concessions, however, might be more effectual to stem the rising tide of nationality. Therein probably lies a greater danger to the rapid growth of the idea of nationality in the country than in a system of repression. Trivial changes in administrative machinery, the reform of the most crying governmental abuses and a few more ineffectual concessions not involving any fundamental change in the principles of government or in the constitution of the same, should not satisfy our people, unless the same are accompanied by a guarantee of fixed institutions, and a fundamental contract recognising a right, a power and a sovereignty in the people. That the opposition of the dominant race will be tremendous and terrible, I readily grant ; but what I fear most is the opposition from within, the opposition of the classes enjoying the special patronage of the Government, the opposition of interest, the opposition of privilege, and last but not the least, the opposition of timidity and cowardice. The divine, whom I quoted in the opening lines of the paper, has in one of his essays on social amelioration drawn the following picture of the attitude of his countrymen towards the social evils existing in English society. He says :

" The attitude of some—let us hope very few— is simply not to care at all, to live in pleasure on the earth and be wanton ; to have hearts as fat as brawn and cold as ice, and as hard as the nether millstone ; to heap up superfluous and often ill begotten wealth, to be hoarded in acquisition, squandered in luxury, or reserved for the building up of idle families. But to men, whose immense riches are squandered, in all but an insignificant fraction, on their own lust and their own aggrandisement comes the stern strong message of St. James, "your riches are corrupted, your garments are moth-eaten. You have lived delicately on the earth, and taken your pleasure. You have nourished your hearts in a day of slaughter." The attitude of others is that of a scornful pity, half cynical, half despairing. * * * * * The attitude of others again is stolid acquiescence. They are weary of the whole thing ; sick of hearing anything about it. It annoys them. Tell them of it and they shrug their shoulders with an impatient "what can we do !" Ask them for help, and they have "so many claims," that they practically give to none. Press the claims and they resent it as a personal insult. Suggest a plan and they call it "Utopian." Describe a case of

anguish and they will call you "sensational." Take part in a public effort and they will sneer at you as "self advertising." The one thing they believe in is selfish *laissez faire*. Things will last their time and that is all they care about. They grow too indulgent and too selfish to care about anything but their own indulgences and their own ease."

Applying this to Indian society, I am afraid, the picture will have to be painted a great deal blacker. There are at any rate no traitors in English society. In our case the chief difficulty does not solely lie in the persistent and deliberate discouragement which is held out by a large section of the community to all efforts towards progress. Here it is not the scoffer and the cynic only that stand in the way of advance but even more dangerous are those who insist to be of you, and with you, but whose heart is not with you, and whose interests, as understood by them, lie the other way. Although they are apt to betray themselves at every other step, they cover their shame by ridiculing the zealous and the earnest, by quietly and philosophically questioning their motives and by poisoning the minds of others against them. Their attitude undergoes no change whether the reform advocated is religious, social or political. The first bores them as an affection of the brain ; the second annoys them as tending towards puritanism and misanthrophy ; the third frightens them. The beauty of the whole thing, however, lies in the fact that large number of them cannot help poking their noses almost everywhere. They enlist as members of societies whose proposed object is to preach religion. They display great interest in social reform so long as it does not interfere with what they call the joys of life. Maintaining an attitude of boldness and defiance to public opinion when the latter proposes to interfere in any way with the "pleasure of life," they are docile as lambs when their ladies and *biradari* (caste) people insist on the celebration of the marriages of their boys and girls at tender ages. As for political associations, these are their special hunting grounds. They have no objection to preside at public meetings or to move or second resolutions or to attend Conferences and Congresses, if it suits their convenience or is likely to be profitable, but all the same they will continue to revel in scoffing at and laughing down those who are serious and earnest about the matter. The general mass of the people are so ignorant of political ideas that it is impossible for

them to understand or find out the real game which these gentlemen are playing. Consequently they are often cowed down and persuaded to let matters alone rather than make a bold stand for their rights.

The first necessity of the situation is, therefore, the coming forward of a number of whole-time workers in each province, devoted to the work of giving political education and imparting right ideas, irrespective and regardless of the scoffer and the cynic. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji exhorts us to agitate, agitate and agitate. I say, Amen ! but on the clear understanding that agitation is an educational duty which has to be performed regardless of success in the shape of concessions. Let the public be accustomed to agitate for the sake of agitation and not in the hope of getting any immediate redress. That is, in my opinion, the only way to ward off disappointments and to prepare the people for more effective methods of political activity. Our esteemed countryman Mr. Tilak advises the people to make the work of administration on the present lines impossible by passive resistance. I say, that is only possible by training the people to a habit of suffering for principles, *i.e.*, to dare and to risk ; and by infusing in them a spirit of defiance wherever a question of principle is involved. The way is to be shown by personal example and not by precept alone. There is the old truth "no risk, no gain." The line of least resistance, of empty resolutions on paper, of simple resolutions, memorials, and not petitions backed up by anything which would place our earnestness beyond the shade of a doubt, is a line of action more worthy of women than of men. If I may be permitted to question the political leaders of the country, what irresistible proofs have they up to this time given of their earnestness for the political demand made by them ? If the time was not and is not ripe for these proofs then why did they not follow the Japanese in making quiet preparations at home before coming out openly with fiery speeches and longwinded resolutious ? If, however, we have not wasted twenty-two years on political agitation and if the Swadeshi and Boycott are not lip-platitudes to be indulged in for the edification of our audiences, let us now take to it seriously and give incontestable proofs of our earnestness for political privileges.

Hitherto our work has lacked that system and solidity which are the outcome of well thought out and well organised plans.

Hitherto the political movement has only been carried out by fits and starts. It has completely depended on the moments of leisure which gentlemen engaged in learned professions and business, could conveniently spare for the same. It has been a labour of love to them, but it has always occupied a secondary position in their thoughts. The country has so far failed to produce a class of men whose chief and prime business in life will be political agitation and political education. The chief and crying need of the national movement is the coming forward of a class of earnest, sincere, able and devoted men, who will move about the country freely and preach the Gospel of freedom, both by word of mouth as well as by example—men who will win over the masses to the cause of Truth and Justice, by words of wisdom and lives of service. The non-existence of this class at the present moment, combined with other difficulties makes the national outlook very gloomy indeed, but the remedy to change the face of things lies in our own hands.

There is an all round awakening in the land, and if the awakening were to be properly utilised by the class of men I have spoken of above, I am sure that the dense gloom that prevails now, will soon be thinned by streaks of encouraging and cheering light, crowed by the dawn of hope and the sunrise of national birth. Most of our people are unnerved by the prevailing disunion and other vices which are the necessary outcome of a foreign domination. It is true that foreign domination is always brought on by disunion but once it has come in, it accentuates the same and adds to its volume and intensity, as without it, it loses the chief reason for its continuance. Some of our people are very angry (and at times rightly) at the narrow, sectarian, denominational spirit that is rampant in the land. In their eyes, it is the chief obstacle in the way of political independence and as a means to obtain the latter, they set about in all sincerity and earnestness to root out the former. All honour to their sentiments and to their impulses. But a calm consideration will show that the task is almost impossible. If the boon of self-government is to be denied to us so long as the people of this country do not give up denominationalism and do not take to one religion or no-religion, I am afraid there can be no hope for us. The problem before us is, to accept the facts before us as they are, and then to build up the edifice of nationality on them or in

spite of them. I hope I shall not be misunderstood. I am not opposed to the cultivation of a spirit of catholicity amongst the followers of the different religions that are to be found in the country. By all means carry on your work in this direction as zealously as you can. I wish you all success. But I cannot persuade myself to believe that it is possible to uproot denominationalism from this land and for matter of that, from any land. Our best efforts should then be directed to create a nation in spite of them. I am not quite sure, if it is desirable to do away with religion or with religious denominations altogether, even if it were possible to do so. All these differences in religion serve their own purposes in the general economy of the world, and there are a good many people whose views are entitled to the greatest respect from us, who are inclined to think that the world would be poorer and monotonous by the entire removal of these differences. Our readers are probably aware of the rebuke administered by Burke to the authors of the French Revolution in their efforts to enforce a universal quality. In his "Reflections on the French Revolution," addressing the people of France, he questions the wisdom of the sweeping changes effected by them in their constitution in the following words :

"In your old States you possessed that variety of parts corresponding with the various descriptions of which your community was happily composed, you had all that opposition of interests, you had that action and counteraction which in the natural and in the political world, from the reciprocal struggle of discordant powers, draws out the harmony of the universe."

I express no opinion upon the force of the anathemas hurled by Burke on the French Revolution, but I cannot help remarking that there is a great deal of truth in the general observation quoted above. The world is, no doubt, good and beautiful only with its diversity. The chief object of human yearning is, has been, and ought to be, to find harmony in diversity. Nations are built and unified by the differences that exist between the various classes of their population. The Apostle of Unity in order to succeed must find a common object to achieve and a common enemy to fight. All differences must be sunk in the presence of the latter and to achieve the former but not necessarily otherwise.

For as this and this only can be the common basis of nationality, I do not think there are insuperable difficulties in the

way of Indian Unity, if the denominational and other differences are faced in that spirit.

Another evil which often staggers us, is the illiteracy and ignorance of our people. Here again, while admitting the absolute necessity of educating the masses, I fail to see the soundness of the proposition, that universal education must precede any demand for self-government. In fact it is hopelss to expect anything like universal education without self-government. Over a century and a quarter of British rule has failed to educate more than five or six per cent. of the people of India, while Japan has been wholly educated within less than forty years. The educational work is one of the most important of our national duties, but by no means should it be made a condition precedent to our demanding self-government. Here, too, the principal question is of men and money. Find out the former and the latter will be forthcoming. That is, therefore the chief thing, for the finding of which, the nation should put forth its best energy and talent.

Give us a dozen men in each province, exclusively devoted to the work of national regeneration, and the situation will at once assume a bright appearance and will promise the most hopeful results. Let us hope that the best talent and the best patriotism of the country are engaged in tapping the resources which are eventually to give us the desired class of men who shall be our national Sanyasis in the present crisis. It was probably said of times like these that "These are the times that try men's souls. The sunshine soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country ; but he that stands to it now, deserves the thanks of man and woman. Tyranny like hell is not easily conquered ; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the contest, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheaply, we esteem too lightly ; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to set a proper price upon its goods ; and it would have been strange indeed if so celestial an article as Freedom should not be highly rated."

17. ADDRESS AT THE ALL-INDIA SWADESHI CONFERENCE

I DO NOT know how to thank you and my countrymen at large for the great kindness which you and they have shown to me. It is impossible to give an adequate expression to the feelings of gratitude and thankfulness that the wonderful reception accorded to me, here, there, and everywhere have evoked in me. Ever since my return from my short and enforced exile I have been the fortunate recipient of so many manifestations of love and regard from my countrymen of all classes, that words seem to be too poor a vehicle to convey my feelings of gratefulness to them. Even if I had a hundred lives to sacrifice in the service of my country they could furnish but poor opportunities of doing adequate justice to the honour and esteem, of which I have been the recipient for the last five weeks. They have touched the deepest chords of my heart and have brightened my vision of the future of my countrymen. The extraordinary outburst of feeling for individuals which has found expression during the last two years throughout the length and breadth of our country is undoubtedly a striking and new spectacle. It cannot be satisfactorily explained by the public service of these men, as though some of them have rendered eminent services to the country it cannot be said of all, and least of all of a humble individual like myself. In my eyes this outburst of feeling has deeper reasons than the services of individuals. It is one indication of the growing consciousness of national unity. India was hitherto said to be only a geographical expression. It has now begun to aspire under the guidance of an all-wise Providence to a unified political existence

Address delivered as President of the All India Swadeshi Conference held in December, 1907 at Surat. Reproduced from *Surat Congress and Conferences* 1907.

and to a place in the comity of nations. The congeries of nations that are said to inhabit this vast territory have after a long period of disunion and disorganisation begun to realise that after all they are one people, with one common blood running through their veins, with common traditions, a common history, and a common faith in the future. It is true that communities are divided from communities, sects from sects and provinces from provinces by differences of religion, language and customs. The wave of Western civilisation, however, with its unifying influences is levelling down these differences and creating a community of interests and feeling which is the precursor of a new dawn in our life. Sometime ago people began to look back and find that, with all their differences, they were after all the branches of a common tree, descendants of the same stock, inheritors of the same civilisation, and, with local differences, practically speakers of the same language. Even Mahomedans, taken as a whole, could not say that in their traditions, languages, and customs, they had nothing in common with the Hindus. This looking backwards made them compare their present position with the position of other people in other parts of the world and led them to look forward. This has awakened the national consciousness which, for want of greater occasions, has begun to exhibit itself in demonstrations and ovations in honour of individuals who have, even by slight sacrifice, earned the distinction of being the servants of the country. Interpreting these ovations in this sense, I feel I have every reason to rejoice over them. I join with you in congratulating myself as being the fortunate recipient of these marks of honour and respect, for which I thank you most sincerely and through you the other classes of my countrymen.

It has, however, been dinned into my ears, ever since I reached Lahore, once more a comparatively free man, that a large number of my countrymen hate me, that my deportation was due principally to Mahomedan machinations, that a number of Hindu gentlemen also had combined, consciously or unconsciously, to bring about, what they considered to be, my ruin and that of the cause I had at heart, that a large number of my friends and co-workers deserted me in the hour of troubles and purchased their safety, either by ignoring me, or by disowning me and my principles I am told, that, under the circumstances, the political amelioration of the country is a hopeless task for which I need waste no more of my time and energies.

I am further told that, in the light of the experience of the last six months, it is futile to base any hope of political salvation on the union of Hindus and Mahomedans, that such union is impossible, that our people are an inert mass having no life to assert and too ignorant to understand their rights, and that the leading men are mostly corrupt, selfish, ease-loving and cowardly, that while talking loudly of political emancipation and liberty, they are wanting in the courage of their convictions and are not prepared to suffer for their ideals, that the political ideas that obtained in the educated party and their conception of political rights were entirely foreign, borrowed bodily from the West without any reference to their suitability to the genius and traditions of the nation, and that, under the circumstances, the best interests of our people lie in directions other than political, and that we should be contented with the sort of government we have got, and should studiously avoid doing anything that may be offensive to the authorities. The incidents of the last three days have unfortunately lent colour to these pleadings and I am told that now, at any rate, I should have no doubt as to the incapacity of my countrymen for the political institutions of the West.

This, however, is the language of despair to which I am not prepared to listen. Firstly, as to the misfortunes of the last six months, I cannot admit that they were entirely due to Mahomedan machinations. I am certain that the so-called Mahomedan machinations were supported and backed by a number of Hindu informers and sycophants, and it is not right to condemn a whole community for the sins of a few. It cannot be doubted for a moment that the country, as a whole, stood fairly well by the victims of official oppression. To me it is a marvel that such was the case, and that the number of traitors and black sheep was not larger than it was found to be. I have had numerous evidences of the sympathy of Mahomedans, other than the limited class of title-hunters, and I still believe that, with the spread of education among Mahomedans the combination of Hindus and Mahomedans for political purposes is not an impossibility. But how can I ever forget the numerous marks of grief and sympathy which I read on the faces of Mahomedan *dhobies* and other low caste people, when the latter happened to pass by me during my walks in the Fort at Mandalay? Why, I saw some of them weeping and shedding tears out of sympathy for me. The authorities tried their level best to prevent my countrymen

at Mandalay from showing any marks of respect towards me, but I can never forget that there were numbers who did not up to the last day yield to this pressure and continued to *salaam* me. The sympathy that I read on the faces of my countrymen while passing by me at Mandalay has left a deep impression on my mind and that impression has been still deepened by what I have seen and felt since my return to my own native land. I do not believe, gentlemen, that the idea of Hindu and Mahomedan unity is only a phantom, but even if it were so, are we representatives of twenty crores of Hindus in India to take things quietly as they are and allow our people to sink deeper and deeper into misery which can only lead them and us to complete national death, which is inevitable if the exisiting political and economic conditions are to continue for any length of time ? I, on my part, gentlemen, decline to give way to pessimism. Mine is a religion of hope and faith. I believe in struggle—a righteous, stern, and unyielding struggle. I am quite prepared for defeats and repulses. The colossal difficulties in the way of success, the discouraging circumstances relied on by the advocates of inactivity do not overwhelm me. In fact, I am inclined to take them as a greater reason for a more determined struggle. According to my political creed every repulse ought to furnish a fresh starting point for a renewed, more righteous, and more vigorous activity. The political principles which I believe in very strongly, are that nations are by themselves made and it is righteousness that exalts a nation. Under the circumstances, my countrymen, my humble advice to you is to be neither nervous nor hysterical, to maintain a dignified, firm, manly, but righteous, attitude amidst difficulties and storms ; and to continue the struggle in the light of the experience gained, "with a heart for any fate, still achieving, still pursuing, learn to labour and to wait."

Now a word as to our mutual relations. True to their instinct and traditions, our enemies are trying to bring about a schism among the patriotic party. Unfortunately their efforts have already met with success and a deplorable schism has already taken place which is extremely painful and humiliating to every patriotic Indian. For some time to come the efforts of every true son of India will have to be directed to bring about a reconciliation amongst brothers that have for the present parted. The latest move is to play Moderates off against Extremists and *vice versa*. To tell you the truth, I do not know

whether these words truly represent the principles of the parties that are called after these names. I for one do not like these names, but if these words are to stick to us, I would beg of my Moderate friends not to play into the hands of the enemies, as to do so will be, in the words of the Hon'ble Gokhale, to make confusion worse confounded. It may be that some of the so-called Extremist methods are not to their liking, but for that reason to give them over to the enemy and to force them or hold them up to the persecution of the Government and the ridicule of the Anglo-Indians will not be wisdom. It would eventually involve us in difficulties and controversies, which might exhaust all the time and energy available for national work. To my Extremist friends I would respectfully appeal not to be impatient of the slowness of age and the voice of practical experience. It will be an evil day for the Hindus, the Mahomedans, and the Parsis, to allow all their national characteristics to be entirely swept away by Western manners and methods. Let us never forget that we are not an upstart people, having no traditions and no past to boast of. Respect for age, regard for seniority, reverence for ties of blood and relationship, constitute the most valuable heritage bequeathed to us by our forefathers and we shall be going backward, rather than forward, in exchanging them for the noisy and, at times, undesirable and pushful manners of the West. In any case, it is absolutely necessary to observe and maintain discipline in public life. Without it we may be only confounding chaos with progress. I would, therefore, beg of you to do nothing which would hamper the growth of the responsible public life in the country. My Moderate and Extremist friends will not, I hope, misunderstand me. I do not say that they have done anything to deserve my remarks. Mine is only a danger signal.

One word more and I have done. The country is now in the grip of a dire famine. The nation that we aspire to serve mostly lives in huts and cottages and is in great distress. The Government is doing its duty, or, at any rate, professes to do it, in providing relief to the unfortunate victims of famine. Shall we, the blood of their blood, lag behind and do nothing to relieve the distress of the aged and the poor? The highest dictates of patriotism require that our sympathies should go forth to the help of the destitute and the wretched and that by sharing what has been given to us with our countrymen in distress we should conclusively establish our claims to speak for them and

to demand their co-operation with us in the ensuing struggle. Our claims to their regard and love should be based upon substantial services and not merely on lip sympathy expressed in paper resolutions. I therefore appeal to my friends and co-workers to put their shoulders to the wheel, to organise a non-official famine relief campaign in the famine-affected provinces, to collect funds and to carry sympathy and help to all homes and places in need of the same. The young, the aged, and the women specially call to us for help, and it will be a shame if we declined to respond to this call and spend the whole stock of our energies in academic controversies and wordy warfare. I know that the work is tremendous and the difficulties still more so, but it affords the most useful and most effective training for a disinterested patriotic life. Even partial success in this direction will be a very valuable moral asset and an object-lesson to those who have to continue the work after us.

Towards the conclusion of his address Lajpat Rai referred to Swadeshi and said that he had been Swadeshist all his life. They were indebted to the Bengalis for having installed Swadeshi on its proper pedestal and created an atmosphere in their Province which had permeated all classes, and unless they tried to extend the scope of Swadeshi irrespective of caste and creeds, they could not hope for greater success. The spirit of Swadeshi ought to prevail in all departments of life subject to one condition, that whatever they had to learn from the West in order to maintain progress and secure prosperity on equal terms, they need not be ashamed to learn from the West. There was no use in going back. They could only go back consistently with the national interests. Otherwise it would be suicidal. They could not but be affected by a predominant civilisation. They must learn to fight out the battle of nationality in modern times under modern conditions and try to use those weapons which were used against them.

18. SOCIAL EFFICIENCY

THAT SOCIAL efficiency is the key to national prosperity and to success in the international struggles is a fact which has now been well recognized by all the great writers on sociology in the new as well as in the old world. It is being freely acknowledged by both the thinker and the legislator that the health, the intellect, the physical and the moral welfare of every man and woman composing a State are no longer the exclusive concern of the man or woman himself or herself or of those interested in him or her on account of ties of blood and relationship, but are the object of anxious regard and solicitude to the nation at large including the greatest, the best and the richest in it. Both individual and national welfare require this regard. Both selfishness and altruism dictate the same policy. That man is a social animal, and has duties towards society, was always understood, but that the welfare of the body politic depended upon the physical, the moral and the intellectual capacities of all the individuals composing it, and that the former had duties and obligations towards the latter as great and binding as those that the individual owes to the society has only very lately dawned on Western minds. The education and help of the poor, and the relief and succour of the needy, the orphan, the blind, the deaf and dumb, the crippled and the sick had always been looked upon as works of merit and charity to be performed by the pious and the charitably inclined rich for the benefit of their souls and in the hope of reward in the next world. The helper of the poor was an epithet of distinction and praise, which the world bestowed upon the benevolent, and philanthropy was mostly dictated by considerations of religion and was almost entirely due to the influence of the latter. It was generally the business of the monk or the parson,

Originally published in the *Modern Review*, Volume IV (1908), No. 3 pp. 229—36.

or of those directly or indirectly under their influence. Outside the church hardly any thought was devoted to it. To give charity or to help the poor was an act of religious merit, having hardly anything to do with the duties and obligations of citizenship. The sense of civic responsibility towards these unfortunate objects of charity was wanting. Even education was confined to the fortunate few. It was valued principally for religious purposes and was considered to be the special privilege of the rich and the noble. The idea of mass education as a national asset had never entered even the European brain. Education being the monopoly of a few, gave its possessors advantages which secured for them great power and influence in the body politic. An educated man was an exception and a rarity. Consequently he wielded vast amount of influence over the rest of the nation, which gave him quite exceptional opportunities to acquire riches and gave political power and influence which were denied to others. It was of course no business of his to give equal opportunities to others and thus to produce rivals and competitors. The only persons amongst the poor who had any opportunities of acquiring knowledge were those who dedicated their lives to the service of the church. But the knowledge which the church dispensed was chiefly religious and was in most cases confined to religous formulas and practices to enable its recipients to perform religious ceremonies and to minister to the spiritual needs of the community. The national uses of education never entered the head of either the statesman or the clergy. The latter in fact waged a great and determined war against the former when the idea of general secular education amongst the masses, as a national asset, first dawned upon the statesman. Long and bloody was this war. It has ended, if it has ended at all, only lately in the complete triumph of the statesman. Education is now almost universally, in Europe and in America, regarded as a national asset of the greatest value. It is being freely recognised everywhere that it is the first and paramount duty of every State, to see that every boy and girl in the body-politic, whether born in lawful wedlock or not, of rich or of poor parents, receives a certain amount of education, at the cost of the nation, if necessary, to give him or her a start in life. Education is no longer dispensed as a dole of charity to be bestowed or given out of mercy or as an act of benevolence. It is no longer the monopoly of those who can pay for it. It is no longer sought as an act of

benevolence or philanthropy. It is a national duty and an obligation with which no State can trifle with impunity. As such it is no longer left to the option of the people to avail themselves of it or not ; it is not open to a parent to send or not to send his boys or girls to school, nor can the boys or the girls evade it of their free will. Education is thus both compulsory and free ; because the idea of corporate social responsibility has been fully grasped and the necessity of social efficiency in international struggles has been understood. The instinct of national self-preservation and the desire of national success in the struggle for supremacy in the affairs of the world has instinctively led nations and statesmen to realize that the cause of national efficiency requires that every child of the nation be educated in such a way as to fit him for the battle of life, no matter whether he or his parents can pay for it or not. Those who can, must pay for it in one shape or the other, nay, whether they will or not, they must also pay for the education of those who have not the means to get education for themselves or their children. This is the genesis of all educational taxes on the continent of Europe and in the new world. The idea is every day growing in volume as well as in intensity, that the children of a nation are its capital and that the future prosperity and success of the nation depend on making the best and the most profitable investment of this capital. It is for this reason that all the self-governing nations of the world are vying with each other in the spread of general education amongst their people, in providing all sorts of facilities to infants, children and young men to acquire knowledge and efficiency and in organizing all educational forces on a national basis. The expenditure on education is growing in every civilized country, and the national vote for funds is generally as large and liberal as the one for the army and the navy. But education is only one phase of the social question; though it is by far the most important and all embracing, as it encompasses both mind and body and includes physical as well as moral fitness. But taking the other phases separately we find that the health of an individual is as important from the social point of view as his mind. Social efficiency must to a very large extent depend upon the physical fitness and the bodily vigour of the units composing the society. Hence we find that social reform on the Continent and in America comprehends among others the following :

(a) The supply of cheap, unadulterated and wholesome food,

including the supply of pure milk for infants and children.

(b) The providing of sanitary and well-ventilated houses for the poor.

(c) The regulation of public health both on preventive and curative lines, the former by providing public parks, common baths, gymnasia, *etc*; and by the supply of good water and good light ; the latter by establishing public hospitals, dispensaries, infirmaries, sanitariums, *etc.*

(d) The protection of children from the vagaries and cruelties of parents as well as others.

(e) The bettering of women's position in society.

(f) The reform of marriage-laws.

(g) Factory legislation to protect those who by pressure of want or by mental imbecility are unable to take care of themselves in their relations towards their employers—the factory-owners.

(h) The recognition of the community's liability to provide for the wants of old age by establishing the system of old-age pensions.

(i) Last, but not the least, the wider diffusion and fair distribution of wealth among the different classes of people that contribute to its production or accumulation.

All these and various other items of the greatest importance and widest significance to the nation at large are included in the programme of social reformers in England and in America. Irrespective of the idea of equal-handed justice and fair opportunities to all to live decent lives, which is the basis of some of these demands, the great idea underlying most of them is the social efficiency of the entire community taken as a whole. Most of them have consequently been brought within the range of practical politics with the result that the different political parties are vying with each other within their respective spheres to give effect to them, so as to establish their claim to the vote of the proletariat and enlist popular sympathy in their favour. Some of the questions, however, which are radically socialistic still form the bone of contention among the

different political parties and are within no near distance of practical realization. But long before any of these questions were brought within the political arena, many a battle was fought over them in private circles and earnest, continued and serious efforts were made to create and educate public opinion about them. For a long time they continued to form the subjects of discussions and debate in clubs, societies and associations, on the platform and in the press, so that at the present moment every one of them possesses a voluminous and at the same time most enlightening literature in every language of Europe. On the most radically socialistic questions the war is still raging and raging furiously. But on a large number of others public opinion has practically settled definite conclusions so as to allow of their being made the subject of positive legislation. About these latter the only subsisting differences between the different political parties that hold power in the State, relate to the ways and means of giving effect to them and in the determination of details ; for example, all parties are agreed as to the duty of the community to provide for the elementary instruction of all children of school-going age. There are, however, differences as to the place of religion in this instruction, the control of religious instruction by the clergy, the composition of general controlling body, the sources of revenue and so on. Similarly there are hardly any differences of principles on the points mentioned in clauses a, b, c, d, and g. A vigorous and uninterrupted contest is constantly raging on and about other questions. Vast amounts of money, talent and energy are being freely and unstintedly spent by those interested in raising issues about the same and in getting their inclusion within the range of practical politics. The question of old-age pension is just now being solved by the parties in power in England and steps are being taken to give effect to it at once, though partially. Similarly the question of the reform of marriage-laws in the interests of the society at large is making rapid progress in America and some State legislatures have already embarked on legislation dealing with the subject. Comparatively few people realize, says Mr. Ely, in his *Evolution of Industrial Society*, how strong is the quiet movement now going forward to regulate marriage with a view to the natural selection of those who are to continue the race. This movement can be traced back for at least forty years. Investigations have been made from time to time during the past thirty years in New York

showing to how large an extent the most unfortunate class of the community are the descendants of those who are physically, mentally and morally unfit.

Again he says, "Regulation of marriage which is proposed and which is being put forward by physicians and thoughtful people—by people who are the farthest removed from any possible designation as cranks—looks beyond the prevention of the marriage of paupers and the feeble-minded....... There lies before the writer the text of the law passed by Michigan, which prohibits the marriage of persons having certain maladies. There also lie before him bills introduced in four legislatures in 1901, to regulate marriage."

On the question covered by (e) we dare say our readers are well aware of the almost "frantic" efforts of the women suffragists in England. What they are now fighting for is the franchise, *i. e.* the right to vote for and gain entry into the Parliament, as they have already gained seats on many of the local bodies. The question covered by (i) has so far received a recognition as to cause comparatively heavy taxes to be imposed upon large inheritances.

Thus our readers will at once realize the close connection between social and political questions in free, independent and self governing countries. The case is, however, entirely different in countries where a foreign nation holds the sway. In such a country the question of advancing social reform by legislation is always a very delicate one. Both the rulers and the ruled approach it with a great deal of natural timidity. While considerations of policy and finance check the zeal of the former, if there be any, suspicion of too much interference in their domestic affairs affects the other. While imperial interests leave no time and opportunity to the former to enter into the spirit of the people and embark on schemes which are likely to involve a great deal of expenditure of money (which can be ill spared from imperial projects) as well as a larger representation of the people in the country's legislative and administrative machinery, the latter themselves are very jealous of having their domestic affairs interfered with by foreigners who, in their opinion, cannot possibly understand them and their institutions so well as to leave no chance of legislative intermeddling doing greater harm and mischief than otherwise. In a country like India, however, where social life is so much mixed up with religion, the difficulties are still greater in

the way of any legislative action in matters social. In the West, as pointed out above, the boundary line between matters social and political is very thin, here the close connection of religion with social life makes it very thick. The safest and the best way, therefore, in this country to effect social reform was and is by universal education, the lukewarm progress of which has so far stood in the way of social reform making head as it otherwise might have done. The cry for universal free elementary education has several times been raised, but it has met with no or scanty response from the authorities for reasons briefly alluded to above *viz.*, considerations of imperial policy and famine. India is, perhaps, the only country on the face of the globe just now where under a professedly civilized system of government (unless Russia is also to be included in this category), the percentage of illiterates is so large, and where a system of free compulsory primary education is not in vogue. Japan, which started much later, has in a few years gone far ahead and left India far behind in the matter of education. The Indian Government has not yet seen its way to recognise the responsibility of the State to improve the social efficiency of the people constituting the State, by providing for universal, compulsory and free elementary education. Why? The reason is plain. The people and the State here are not identical. The people do not constitute the State. The State is something above and beyond the people. Hence the interests of the former as understood by its statesmen take precedence of those over the latter.

This makes the work of social reform in this country still more difficult and uphill than in other countries. Social reform here has to be scrupulously kept apart from politics and consequently fails to arouse that enthusiasm which is so necessary for the successful working of all public movements. It has, moreover, to a certain extent, to consult and if possible to reconcile the religious angularities of the different religious denominations (and their number is legion) that find allegiance in this land. So far religions and religious prejudices have been its chief enemies. But for them the progress might have been greater and more rapid; though, however paradoxical it might seem, its success and its achievements, too, whatever they are, are greatly due to the intercession of religious authority. Speaking of social reform amongst the Hindus, it was a religious movement (that of the Brahmo Samaj) which gave it birth and nursed it in its lap. Then it was another religious movement, *viz.* the Arya Samaj, which

supplied the momentum for its successful march onward. It is again the gradual conversion of another religious movement (originally its opponent) to its side, *viz*, that of the reformed Sanatan Dharma, that is conferring new vitality upon it. In an intensely religious (some might sarcastically call it religion-ridden) country like India it was perhaps impossible to do anything substantial in the way of social reform without the help of religion. General enlightenment brought about by liberal education and the irresistible contact with the West with which so many material interests are bound up, was no doubt, bound to give birth to a social reform movement in India ; but except for the ready and handy co-operation of religion, the progress would have been extremely slow and highly unsatisfactory in more ways than one. Amongst Mohammadans, even the great Sir Syed Ahmed had to apply himself to a liberal commentary of the Quran in order to find the necessary sanction for his social reform movement. Amongst Hindus also the movement perhaps would have been stronger and more successful than it has been, if the authority of the ancient religious literature had been orginally invoked on its side as was at a later stage done by Pandit Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar and Swami Dayanand Saraswati and is now being done by the reform party amongst the Sanatanists. Social reform thus like all other important movements in the world, has to make a great struggle for getting a national sanction. The nation had to be lectured off and on, on the absolute necessity of social efficiency before any progress could be made. Reason, rationalism, science and religion had all to be brought into the field before a substantial breach was made in the citadel of superstition and deep rooted prejudices. That a substantial and never to be repaired breach has after all been made is abundantly clear from the awakening conciousness of the intelligent among those who had so bravely and so gallantly held the citadel for so long against all assailants. The attitude of the Central Hindu College authorities[1] towards social reform in general (leaving some questions aside on which there is still great difference of opinion) is an incontestable proof of the national awakening to the absolute necessity of social efficiency for progress. So far the field has been opened. As an evidence of this general feeling for social reform we may now examine how far the idea of national efficiency has descended to practice and how for the nation has accepted responsibility of each and all for the good of the

whole.

Judging from the private educational activity in different provinces we may fairly infer that the necessity of a system of national education for national efficiency has pretty generally been accepted. There are wide differences of opinion on what national education means and what it may comprise, but there seems to be unanimity on the absolute necessity of educating the classes as well as the masses of the nation for national efficiency. Further, the prevailing sense amongst the educated classes is based on an idea of duty. The educated classes have realized or have begun to realize that it is their duty to educate the rest of their countrymen and if they fail in its discharge they will be failing in their *dharma* towards their country, which failure will be a standing hindrance in the way of national progress and a standing menace to national as well as individual interests. The Fergusson College at Poona, with its affiliated schools, the Metropolitan and many of the other numerous private colleges and schools in Bengal and Bihar, the M.A.O. College at Aligarh, with a number of Islamic schools and colleges spread over the land, the Vedic and Anglo-Sanskrit schools, the Central Hindu College, Banaras, with its Hindu schools, the Gurukul Kangri, Hardwar, with other similar Gurukuls in the Punjab and the United Provinces and last but not the least, the National College in Calcutta with its national schools, are standing monuments of the birth of this idea of national efficiency.[2] It is not a sense of charity that impels the organizers and conductors of these institution, but a sense of duty towards the different social units which they represent.

The sense of duty has grown sufficiently strong to enable highly able, gifted and wealthy men to undergo sacrifices of a high order for its sake. The ennobling and inspiring sacrifices of men of the type of Messrs. Gokhale and Paranjpe, of the late Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, of Lala Hans Raj, of Lala Bhagwan Dass, of Lala Munshi Ram and of Principal A. Ghose in the cause of education are sufficient indications of the working of the idea that social efficiency is a *sine qua non* of national progress, and that education is the best means of securing social efficiency. The idea that the cause of education is a national cause, which each and every Indian must serve, is spreading and the various social organizations are taking it up. These social organizations or caste-conferences as they are called have a mischievous tendency in so far as they tend to perpetuate

the caste-system as it exists and may at any time be used for causing disunion. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that their lead be in safe and trustworthy hands. In the hands of these latter, they can be used to advance the cause of education and social reform to some extent at least. They can at any rate disseminate the idea of corporate social responsibility of a certain social unit for the welfare and prosperity of all the members composing it. But in the interest of general national efficiency they require to be watched with great care and vigilance so that there be no chance of their getting narrower than they are or being used in the interest of individuals or for purposes other than national. This is, however, only by the way. What I was driving at was that the idea that the education of all the members of the nation is a national asset and a national concern is being gradually grasped by the different communities composing the Indian nation, and that it requires to be pushed on with logical consistency in all its phases. This subject is so important and has, of late, come to such prominence that it need not be pursued any more here. There is no danger of its being lost sight of in the vortex of general political agitation. There seems to be a consensus of educated public opinion that not only general education but commercial, professional and technical education also requires to be looked after in the national interest. There is a wide spread desire to found educational institutions on national lines and under our own control. People are beginning to learn the absolute duty of making sacrifices for the cause of national education.

There is one more social question on which the various religious units composing the nation seem to have realized their duty, *viz*, in the matter of the rescue of their orphans. For a long time the Hindu community allowed its waifs and orphans to be taken away and absorbed by other religious denominations. This was due to a want of a sense of social duty towards them. This has been or is now being comprehended. The idea of charity, however, greatly dominates this branch of our social work ; though I am confident that gradually the idea of duty (*dharma*) will replace the former effectually. It, by no means follows, however, that what is being done is quite satisfactory. Certainly a great deal more is required, but it is gratifying that the number of such institutions is on the increase and the community is awakening to a sense of its duty in this matter.

We are, however, afraid that the Indian social reformer has so far done practically little in the matter of checking the great mortality amongst infants. The appalling infant mortality in this country requires immediate attention at the hands of the social reformer. At the time of the last Social Conference at Surat I was informed that the matter had been taken up by the Bombay reformers. The evil is, however, not confined to Bombay alone and the other provinces should not lag behind in the matter. Societies for the protection of children should be organized in all the important towns in Northern India, which would undertake to disseminate the idea by means of public lectures and brief pamphlets. The question is no doubt to a certain extent included in the greater question of female education. The prominence given to female education in the programme of social reform is quite justified and will eventually be a fairly effectual check on infant mortality. But female education alone will not solve the whole question. In the West, where the mothers are generally educated ladies, other remedies have had to be applied to decrease the appalling percentage of infant mortality. There is a vital connection between food and infant mortality, and in this respect, I am afraid, we are getting into worse conditions than those that prevail in Europe. Nature had provided us with a plentiful supply of good and wholesome food. Our milk supply was also quite sufficient ; but civilization has its own penalties to exact, and in the train of Western civilization have come penury and poverty. On all sides you hear the cry of insufficient and bad food. Hundreds and thousands of our countrymen, nay, millions do not get sufficient to have a fill even once a day. There are millions who live on bad food which in civilized countries would not be placed before cattle even. We are face to face with a food difficulty of the greatest magnitude. Food in India is getting scarce and dear. The supply of milk and butter is getting deficient, and a great deal of adulteration is going on in these two chief articles of Indian diet. Milk is the chief article of diet for infants and what hope can there be for the vast majority of Indian infants, if that article of diet also is going to be scarce for them ? I am afraid, pure, unadulterated milk can be had cheaper in London than in the presidency towns of India. In London it is not difficult to get a tumbler of good milk, containing a pound of milk, for a penny, though we cannot say the same about Calcutta and Bombay. The question, therefore, is assuming great

importance and ought to be at once taken up by the Social Reform Associations all over India. What shall our children do without milk ? How are we to have it unadulterated, in abundance, and on reasonable prices is a problem to be solved ? Considering the physical helplessness of the population, which the scarcity of milk increases, I think the question of a pure milk supply is of the greatest importance both from the humane and national point of view, a proper consideration of which can no longer be delayed without incurring great risks. This does not take away from the importance of the question of general food supply in India, in face of the famine rates that prevail even in normal times.

Ghi, which is so necessary for a Hindu in all the different phases of his life, is becoming scarce and is in some municipal cities being taxed as a "luxury". A Hindu requires *ghi* at his birth, at his tonsure, at his *upanayana*, at his marriage, at his death. His gods cannot be pleased without *ghi* ; much less can his own god (*i. e.* his own stomach). But *ghi*, good *ghi*, cannot be had except at exhorbitant prices. Millions of people have to go without *ghi* ! How can those who can scarcely get wheat or barley to eat, go in for *ghi* or milk. The condition is becoming indescribably sad and requires the immediate attention of national leaders.

There is one more question which I will touch, before bringing this article to a close, as I consider it to be of very great importance for the national efficiency, *viz.*, the condition of the depressed classes among Hindus. The Hindu community must once for all recognise that the caste system, as it prevails now, is doomed and that its rigidity must be relaxed if the Hindus are to improve as a social unit. That the condition of these lower classes is deplorable and requires immediate attention is admitted on all hands. Large numbers of them are being lost to the Hindu community, because the latter would not give them any social status and would not otherwise improve their condition. These are the classes which suffer most in times of scarcity and famine and it is absolutely necessary that effective measures be adopted to educate them, to lift them in the social scale and to give them work which will enable them to get sufficient for a decent living. At present they are a drag, but with a little care they can be converted into a source of strength and power. The community, as a whole, have not as yet realized their duty in the matter. What little is being done in Bombay

and the Punjab is being done more from religious and philanthropic motives than from the point of view of social efficiency. The subject is of such great importance that I propose to deal with it in a separate paper.

A word now as to the meetings of the Social Conference. I think it is high time that the programme of the Indian Social Conference should undergo a change and that instead of rushing through the programme in the course of a few hours, the work of the conference be given greater importance than is being attached to it now, by holding it at a different time of the year than in the week, the greater part of which is occupied by the Indian National Congress. What the Conference might lose in spectacular effect, will be more than gained otherwise by greater attention being bestowed on thinking out modes of practical work and on finding ways and means to give effect to them.

19. MAHOMEDAN REPRESENTATION ON THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

PERMIT ME to offer a few observations on the controversy that is going on in your columns on the subject of Mahomedan representation on the Legislative Councils of India, when the latter are reconstituted in accordance with Lord Morley's scheme.

1. I think it will be relevant to inquire on how many occasions within the last forty-seven years or so, ever since the Indian Councils Act of 1861 came into force, the Legislative Councils of India had to deal with questions exclusively or specially affecting the Muslims of India as distinguished from their non-Muslim countrymen. It might also be important to know how many times, if at all, there was a conflict of opinion between the Hindu and Mahomedan members of these Councils. It is not perhaps so well known as it ought to be in this country that in all matters of inheritance, marriage, divorce, dower, *etc.* Hindus are governed by the Hindu law and Mahomedans by the Mahomedan law. The Legislative Councils are not supposed to meddle with or modify the provisions of any of these laws. Besides, even independently of this, there is little or no chance of any measure coming before these Councils by which the interests of one religious community may be more injuriously affected than those of the other.

2. Great stress has been laid in certain quarters on special consideration to be shown to Indian Mahomedans on the ground of their loyalty and military service. Are we to understand, then, that the extension of franchise in India is being granted as a reward for loyalty and military services to the Empire ? If so how is it that no ex-Lieutenant-Governor has as yet raised his voice for special representation being granted on that ground to the Sikhs,

Letter to the *Times*, London. Reproduced from *The Mahratta*, 21 February 1909.

the Gurkhas, the Rajputs and the Jats? It might also be interesting to tabulate the services, rendered by the Mahomedans, the Sikhs, the Gurkhas, the Rajputs, and the Jats in military expeditions on the North-West Frontier, in Egypt China and Abyssinia, and find out on which side there is a balance.

3. With reference to the argument based upon the fact of the Hindus including large numbers of untouchables and low castes, it should be noted that if there are untouchables and low castes among the Hindus there are the same castes or classes among the Mahomedans as well. If the census figures of 1901 are at all reliable, we find that the Punjab alone claims to have over half a million of *churas*, *mochis* and *mussallies*, as against a lesser number of Saiyyads and Pathans, the two of the highest castes of Mahomedans. Roughly speaking, the former three castes number about 660,000, while the latter two only 500,000. That is in spite of the fact that most Hindu converts to Islam belonging to low castes have a peculiar knack of conferring a higher caste status on them at the time of the census.

4. In the course of the controversy it has been admitted that even in the Punjab the Hindus and the Sikhs are better educated and more enterprising, and that they are more "affluent" than their Mahomedan countrymen. They are certainly better agriculturists (see Mr. Ibbetson's Census Report[1]), and as good, if not better soldiers. But under Lord Morley's scheme the Mahomedans of the Punjab will have a larger number of seats on the Legislative Council of that province than their Hindu and Sikh countrymen, because they are numerically in a majority in the province. In one of the letters published by the *Times* over the signature of a distinguished Mahomedan, language was used to signify that the scheme was likely to give satisfaction in the Punjab. If so, why ought not the same principle to hold good for the rest of India?

5. I do not wish to say one unkind word in reply to the argument based upon the so-called historical and political importance of the Mahomedans of India, a vast majority of whom are only the descendants of Hindu converts, and are as much divided into castes and sub-castes as the Hindus. But does the All-India Muslim League seriously think that backwardness in education, want of organization, and want of enterprise are substantial grounds for

claiming a larger representation than their numbers entitle them to ?

6. As the representative character of the Indian National Congress has so often been ridiculed by Anglo-Indians and Muslims together, will it not be pertinent to ask if the All-India Muslim League, an organization started only two years ago,[2] is more representative in character than the Indian National Congress ? This does not involve any slur on the gentlemen who profess to speak in the interests of the Indian Muslims. Their education and position entitle them to a right to do so, but is there any reason to credit them with an exclusive right to speak for the general body of Mahomedans in India, and deny the same to those of their co-religionists who belong to the Indian National Congress ? While no sensible man can cavil at the educated Mahomedans agitating for the protection of the rights of their co-religionists within proper bounds, I think, it will be on the whole well in the interests of order and peace in India if, in doing so, they were to avoid saying and doing things which may be calculated to create an impassable gulf between the Hindus and Mahomedans, because to me it seems that goodwill between the two communities is even more valuable than seats on the Legislative Councils.

20. THE DEPRESSED CLASSES

THERE CAN be no denying the fact that the rigidity of the Hindu caste system is the bane of Hindu society. It is a great barrier in the way of the social and national progress of the Hindus. It confronts them at every step and slackens the speed with which, otherwise, the nation would climb up to the heights of national solidarity. The condition of the "low" castes, sometimes described as "untouchables", at other times as the "depressed classes," is nothing short of disgraceful. It is a disgrace to our humanity, our sense of justice, and our feeling of social affinity. It is useless to hope for any solidarity so long as the depressed classes continue to be so low in the social scale as they are. The intellectual and moral status of the community as a whole cannot be appreciably raised without the co-operation of *all* the classes forming the community. So long then, as there are *classes* amongst us who are untouchable by the so-called superior classes, because of their having been born of certain parents, the moral and intellectual elevation of the community as a whole can only proceed by slow, very slow, degrees. The condition of the depressed classes is a standing blot on our social organisation, and we must remove that blot if we are really desirous of securing the efficiency of our social organism. All the parts of a whole must be raised, not necessarily to the same level but to a level from which they can, by their individual efforts, talents and achievements, rise to the highest possible position within the reach of the members of the social organism.

The present arrangement is a cruel and unjust arrangement. Besides, it is both economically and politically unsound. A community which allows so much valuable human material to rot in a state of utter depression and helplessness, cannot be said to be

Originally published in *The Modern Review*, Calcutta, July 1909.

economically wise. As to the political danger involved by the continuance of these classes in their present condition, one need only look at the arguments advanced by our friends of the Muslim League in support of their contention for a lar representation on the Legislative Councils than they are entitled to by virtue of their numerical strength. Quite ignoring the fact that they are as much affected by these classes as the Hindus, they make it a point to say that in counting the Hindus for the purposes of representation the untouchables enumerated with them should be excluded. Whatever may be the value of this argument for the purpose for which it is used, there can be no doubt that the existence of these classes in their present deplorable condition is a menace to the power and influence of the Hindu community. The line of argument adopted by our Muslim friends and also by some missionary critics of the Reform Scheme, ought to open the eyes of the Hindus to the absolute necessity and urgency of raising the social status of their fellow-religionists, called and known as the members of the depressed classes. Thus from every point of view, whether that of humanity, justice or fairplay, or that of self-interest, it is the bounden duty of the so called high-caste Hindus to give a helping hand to their brothers of the "low castes" and raise them socially as well as intellectually. We are living in a democratic age. The tendencies of democracy are towards the levelling down of all inequalities.

That there are forces working amongst us which will sooner or later demolish all artificial barriers due to accidents of birth between man and man, is patent to all far-sighted people. Under any circumstances, then, the day of the depressed classes is bound to come If so, would it not be wise to take time by the forelock, and to take in hand, in all willingness, what other forces, which are not in our control, must perforce bring about ? I say this not because I have the least doubt about the shocking injustice involved in the existing arrangements, but because it is perfectly legitimate to point out the moral of our neglecting to do what is right, and by the weight of that moral to ask people to avoid the evil consequences of letting the forces of nature to have their own revenge. Morality requires that we should take to the work of elevating the depressed classes out of a sheer sense of justice and humanity regardless of any outside considerations. But to appeal in the name of expediency, when the latter strengthens the demands of morality and humanity, involves no

breach of principle, and we may very well point out that the communal interest of the Hindus also lies that way. There are agencies at work which are doing their best to remove these Hindus from the pale of Hinduism, which, bereft of these classes, might live, but only as an exhausted frame. The classes themselves are anxious to remain Hindus even though the latter may not promise them the fullest social privileges which they may be in a position to obtain by change of religion. The only thing for Hinduism to do is to meet them half way at once and remove at least the principal grounds of their depression. The least that we can do without delay is to make the untouchables touchable and take away the sting out of their names. Hindu who is not prepared to do even this is an enemy to the community, however unconscious he may be of the great injury he is causing it thereby. I confess, we, the educated Hindus, are not doing our duty in the matter honestly and manfully. Most of our time and energies are employed in agitating for trivial political rights, the good of which can at best be remote, to the neglect of questions upon the right solution of which depends our immediate safety as a nation. I am only repeating what I have already said times out of number, that the work of nation-building must be begun from below. The nation that has to be built up lives in huts and not in palaces. Legislative Councils principally composed of the latter are not likely to be the best instruments of building the nation from below. I say this without in any way disparaging the agitation to obtain more legislative powers, but I cannot help saying that to me there seems to be a lack of proportion in the importance that is being attached to a scheme which for the present at least altogether ignores the masses as well as the lower middle classes.

II

A study of the Vedic literature will make it clear to any one approaching it with an unbiased mind that on the authority of what are admitted to be the original sources of Hindu religion and its manifold variations there can be no justification for the treatment which the present-day high-caste Hindus accord to the so-called low castes. There is abundant authority for the proposition that caste in ancient India was interchangeable and that outsiders could, after going through certain rites, be admitted into the highest castes and into the best of social circles ; that there was no permanent and absolute bar by birth ; that it was open to individuals by personal

merit to rise to the highest religious and social positions in the society of the Aryans.

In a paper read before the Asiatic Society of Bengal on the "Vratya and Sankara Theories of Caste" Mahamahopadhyay Pandit S.C. Vidyabhusana, M.A., Ph. D., M.R.A.S., expresses the following opinion about the solidarity of the ancient social organisation of the Hindus and about the flexibility of their caste system.

"The Brahman Legislators", says he, "by tracing the four original castes from the different limbs of Brahma, the Supreme Being, and their deriving all other castes from a mixture of the four, thoroughly established the unity and common footing of all the members of the Hindu society. All castes, from Brahmana to Chandala, are shown to be directly or indirectly connected with the Supreme Being and the gradations of honour maintained among the members of different castes are also duly maintained....... The *Vratya* people, having performed the *Vratya*-Stoma could freely mix with members of the four pure and original castes on terms of equality."

In an earlier part of the paper the writer explains that the term 'Vratyas' includes :

"All people—whether natives of India or foreigners—who were not within the pale of Brahmanic Civilization." The fallen members of the three high castes were also called "Vratya." In the later Shastras the term 'Vratya' also signified "those members of the first three castes who would not observe the religious rites enjoined on them by the Shastras, specially those who failed to invest themselves with the sacred thread at the proper time and had to be degraded from their community."

According to Manu 'Vratya' is defined to be a Brahman, Kshatriya or Vaishya who has lost caste through non-observance of Shastric rites. Manu takes special pains to fix the caste status of the offspring of mixed marriages, *viz.*, marriage of high-caste men and low-caste women, or of high-caste women and low-caste men or marriages of Aryan men with non-Aryan women, *etc.*, which conclusively establishes the prevalence of these marriages at the time of the compilation of the present *Manu-Sanhita*. Pandit S.C. Vidyabhusana has quoted chapter and verse in support of the above conclusions. I am disposed to think that other authorities also can be added to those cited by the learned Pandit. Thus it can be safely said that

there is plenty of Shastric authority to justify the following propositions :

(a) That the Aryas, the forefathers of the present Hindus, used to admit foreigners into the pale of their society on the performance of certain rites and they freely intermarried and interdined with them according to the social position assigned to them

(b) That intermarriage and interdining was not necessarily confined to each caste.

(c) That persons degraded or outcasted were readmitted into their original castes on the performance of certain rites which were originally very simple but which grew in complication and rigidity, with the growth of rigidity in the caste system.

A vast majority of those who now form the depressed classes are "Vratyas" in the sense that their ancestors lost their original caste status by failure to perform religious rites and by taking to occupations which were not approved by their caste-people. Some of them must be the offspring of mixed marriages between high-caste women and low-caste men, others there may be, foreign "Vratyas", whose ancestors were originally admitted into the pale of Hinduism by performance of certain rites, who lost the position thus gained by subsequent lapses to their original habits and manners. One thing, however, is clear that these classes are still Hindu and wish to remain Hindu. To me that seems enough for all practical purposes. Apart from considerations of humanity and philanthropy it is the duty of Hindus as such to give them full recognition and also opportunities for improving their social lot. I may safely presume that the question has now advanced beyond the stage of theoretical speculation or theological discussion.

In educated circles there seems to be fairly practical unanimity as to the inherent injustice and monstrosity of the existing system ; nay, even further, there seems to be an agreement as to the desirability of taking steps to elevate the moral, material and social condition of the classes that have been most affected by the prevailing rigidity of the caste system. What stands in the way of progress in this direction, however, is the prejudice of the illiterate and the apathy of the educated classes. The former are wanting in that broad outlook on human affairs without which the consciousness of a sense of corporate social responsibility is slow to awaken, the latter lack in

that backbone without which it is impossible to bring about changes which look radical but the absence of which blocks the avenues that lead to national consciousness and national solidarity.

For the latter purpose what is required is fairness and humanity at least, if not perfect equality in the relations of the different units that compose the social organism.

At the present moment the greatest strength of the Hindus consists in their number. It is true that intellectually and educationally, in trade and commerce, in brain and body, in mind and muscles, in the arts of peace and war, they are second to none. In their potentialities too they are inferior to none. But in their numerical strength lies that power which is not shared by any other community in this country. This numerical strength, however, may easily be converted into the chief source of their weakness if not properly organised for national purposes. At first sight the Hindus look a heterogeneous mass of untidy humanity without any ties to bind them to one another. Their lack of homogeneity is their curse. To an outsider they seem to agree in nothing. Caste and inter-caste jealousies block the way to progress. The energies which should be spent in bringing about solidarity are being spent in rearing up individuality in the different social units which make up the community. The Brahman, the Khatri, the Banya, the Kayastha, the Rajput, the Jat ; among Brahmans the Gaud, the Sanadhya, the Nagar, the Kanaujia ; &c. &c., are all dominated by separatist tendencies. Their collective ambition moves in the circumscribed circle of their own little group, which gives a sectional or rather only a sub-sectional colour to their patriotism or nationalism, but what is even worse is their attitude towards the lower classes and the latter's attempt to retaliate. The former's denial of equal or any opportunities of worship to the latter in their temples or shrines is a standing disgrace to the good name of Hinduism. The so much boasted of tolerance of the Hindus disappears, the moment that tolerance is demanded by the classes lower in the social scale. The high-caste Hindus of the present day, men who have received their education under Western ideals, are often heard to speak with pride of the spirit of toleration possessed and shown by Hinduism towards other religions and other communities, but a critic may very well say that this toleration is the offspring of fear or greed. You dare not be uncivil or unkind

to Mohammadans or Christians because they can make matters unpleasant for you, but you are insolent towards your own people, whom you think you can defy without any fear of retaliation. The consequences are plain and can be seen even running. The Hindus are going down in numbers. Your insolence towards the lower classes of Hindus is being repaid by the latter running their back on you. Mohammadanism and Christianity are extending their arms to embrace them and indications are not wanting of the readiness of the lower classes of Hindus to accept the hospitality of non-Hiudu religious and social systems. Why, the reason is obvious. As a Hindu you won't touch him ; you would not let him sit on the same carpet with you, you would not offer him water in your cups, you would not accept water or food touched by him ; you would not let him enter your temples, in fact you would not treat him like a human being. The moment, however, he becomes a Mohammadan or a Christian, without even giving up his ancestral occupation, you are all smiles to him, you welcome him to your home ; and have no objection at times to offer him drink and food in your utensils etc. It is a deep-rooted sentiment that has so far prevented the depressed classes of Hindus from deserting Hinduism *en-masse.* Sentiments are, however, melting away before the matter-of-fact civilization of the West. The time does not seem to be very distant when sentiment will cease to control the desire of the depressed classes to better their social position, if it cannot be had otherwise than by a change of faith. There are circumstances and causes in the environments of these classes which are working with effect to bring about that consummation and if the Hindus want to avoid that catastrophe, it is time that they subordinated their caste pride to the exigencies of the situation and took time by the forelock.

III

Commenting on the figures of the Census of 1901, giving the respective strength of the three principal religions of India, Sir H. Risley remarks :

"During the ten years preceding the census of 1901, the Mohammadans increased by nine per cent. and the Christians by nearly twenty-eight per cent.......Hinduism is the dominant religion of India; in all its developments it is intimately associated with caste, and the two sets of factors, the social and the religious, can hardly be

considered apart. The two rival creeds, Christianity and Islam, for Buddhism may be left out of account, avowedly reject the principle of caste, and have been affected by its influence solely through their contact with Hinduism. So long as Hinduism shows no decline from its present strength, caste will preserve its ancient reign, and nothing short of a great accession of strength to either Islam or Christianity can materially modify the social and religious future of India. Are there any signs of a tendency in this direction? Can the figures of the last census be regarded as in any sense the forerunners of an Islamic or Christian revival which will threaten the citadel of Hinduism or will Hinduism hold its own in the future as it has done through the long ages of the past?

"The statistics of the last census show that during a decade of famine the Mohammadans in India increased by nine per cent. No doubt these proportions were affected by the fact that the famines were most severe in those parts of the country where the Mohammadans are relatively least numerous, but in the fertile and wealthy region of Eastern Bengal, which has never been touched by real famine, though people on small fixed incomes suffer from high prices, their rate of increase was 12.3 per cent. or nearly double that of the Hindus. The figures illustrating the proportion of children tell a similar tale, and indicate that in that part of India the Mohammadans are not only more enterprising and therefore better off than their Hindu neighbours, but also more prolific and more careful of their offspring."

Sir H. Risley then explains the reasons for these conditions, with some of which we are not directly concerned just now. One of the causes contributing to the increase in the number of Mohammadans is said to be conversions to Islam, about which he remarks:

"Conversions from Hinduism to Islam must also contribute in some degree to the relatively more rapid growth of the Mohammadan population. Here no appeal to statistics is possible, but a number of specific instances of such changes of religion were extracted by Mr. Gait, C. I. E., from the reports of Hindu and Mohammadan gentlemen in 24 Districts and published as Appendix II to the Bengal Census Report of 1901. The motives assigned in various cases—names and particulars are usually given—may be grouped somewhat as follows:

1. Genuine religious conviction of the purity and simplicity of Islam, derived from study of the Mohammadan scriptures or from the preaching of the Maulvies who go round the villages.

2. The growing desire on the part of lower Hindu castes to improve their social position leads individuals among them to embrace a creed which seems to offer them a fair chance in life. Malis, Kahars, Gowalas, Napits, Kans, Baildars and other castes of similar status furnish numerous illustrations of this tendency.

4. Causes connected with taboos on food and drink and with various caste misdemeanors have also to be taken into account. Hindus in sickness and distress are tended by Mohammadans and take food and water from their hands ; the caste excommunicates them and they join the ranks of a more merciful faith.

It is needless to observe that none of these causes, nor all of them taken together, exercise an influence wide and potent enough to bring about a great Islamic revival in India. The day of conversions *en masse* has passed, and there are no signs of its return. Nevertheless certain tendencies are discernible which may add materially to the number of individual conversions. On the one hand, the Mohammadans may raise their standard of education, they may organize and consolidate their influence, they may establish their claim to larger representation in the Legislative Councils and in Government service, and they may thus come to play in Indian public life a part more worthy of the history and traditions of their faith. On the other hand, the spread of English education among the middle and lower ranks of the Hindus may lead to a revolt against the intolerance of the higher castes, and in particular against their virtual monopoly of place and power.

In Southern India whole castes have been known to become Mohammadans because the Brahmans would not allow them to enter Hindu temples and compelled them to worship outside. It is conceivable that other castes in other parts of India will some day realize that for the low-born Hindu the shortest road to success in life, whether at the bar or at the public service, may lie through the

portals of Islam.

Faithful to its earliest traditions, Christianity in India has from the first devoted itself to the poor and lowly, and its most conspicuous successes have been attained among the Animists and the depressed castes of Hinduism. To the Animist haunted by a crowd of greedy and malevolent demons ever thirsting for blood, like the ghosts that flocked round Ulysses, Christianity opens a new world of love and hope. To the Pariah, the Mahar, the Dher and a host of other helots, it promises release from the most searching and relentless form of social tyranny—the tyranny of caste ; it offers them independence, self-respect, education, advancement, a new life in an organised and progressive society. "These people," says Mr. Francis, writing of the Pariahs of the South, "have little to lose by forsaking the creed of their fore-fathers. As long as they remain Hindus they are daily and hourly made to feel that they are of commoner clay than their neighbours. Any attempts which they may make to educate themselves or their children are actively discouraged by the classes above them ; caste-restrictions prevent them from quitting the toilsome, uncertain and undignified means of subsistence to which custom has condemned them, and taking to a handicraft or a trade ; they are snubbed and repressed on all public occasions ; are refused admission even to the temples of their gods and can hope for no more helpful partner of their joys and sorrows than the unkempt and unhandy maiden of the paracheri with her very primitive notions of comfort and cleanliness. But once a youth from among these people becomes Christian his whole horizon changes. He is as carefully educated as if he was a Brahman ; he is put in the way of learning a trade or obtaining an appointment as a clerk ; he is treated with kindness and even familiarity by missionaries who belong to the ruling race (?!) ; he takes an equal part with his elders and betters in the services of the church ; and in due time he can choose from among the neat-handed girls of the Mission a wife skilled in domestic matters and even endowed with some little learning. Now-a-days active persecution of converts to Christianity is rare. So those who hearken to its teaching have no martyr's crown to wear, and sheltered, as they often are, in a compound round the missionary's bungalow, it matters little to its adherents if their neighbours look askance upon them. The remarkable growth in the numbers of the native Christians thus

largely proceeds from the natural and laudable discontent with their lot which possesses the lower classes of the Hindus, and so well do the converts as a class use their opportunities that the community is earning for itself a constantly improving position in the public estimation."

Making a sufficient allowance for the Padre's anxiety to paint thick—Hinduism black and the chances afforded by conversion to Christianity bright—there remains enough to put the thoughtful Hindu to shame. We do not mind those cases of apostacy from Hinduism where the change of religion results from a change of religious convictions, but we have every reason to be ashamed of those conversions that are the direct result of our insolence and inhumanities towards the so-called lower classes. It is high time that our indifference to the lot of the depressed classes ceased and we gave them a new start in social life.

These quotations should leave no doubt in the mind of any Hindu as to the urgency and importance of the question of improving the lot of the depressed classes and of raising their social status. I am of opinion that the matter should be taken in hand in each province by influential provincial committees composed of men of provincial reputation. Depressed classes missions for smaller areas should be organised under the guidance and control of these committees and the work pushed through with earnestness and zeal. The sympathies of young men should be enlisted, from whom eventually some may be inclined to make it their life work. The subject has an important bearing on famine relief and the development of home industries, from which point of view I intend to discuss it in another article.

21. LAJPAT RAI AND THE CONGRESS, 1909

IT WAS not my intention to enter into any controversy with regard to the Congress for at least sometime more to come. What little experience of public life I have had, demonstrated to me the wisdom of keeping aloof from a controversy in which one cannot definitely take sides and wishes well to both. That was and has been my attitude towards the Congress controversy after the split of December 1907 at Surat. During my tour in connection with famine relief, I repeatedly declined to answer questions asked with a view to elicit my opinion as to the respective liability of the two parties in bringing about the split. On my return from England in March 1909, I received a private letter from one of the General Secretaries of the Congress about the situation in the Punjab and in a confidential reply I communicated my views to him, authorising him to communicate the same, if he thought necessary, to Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and Mr. Gokhale. It should be noted that the present controversy in *The Panjabee* was started before my return and in the starting of it I had absolutely no hand. In fact it was after my arrival at Lahore that I read the articles contributed by Mr. "Observer." I do not share "Observer's" political opinion in full, nor am I responsible for the opinions of *The Panjabee*, but even differing from them on important matters of principle and detail, I am strongly of opinion that the efforts to hold the next session of the Congress at Lahore in defiance of the best Hindu opinion of the Province are unwise and not in the best interests of the country, the Province, and the Congress. It is a well-known fact that the great bulk of educated Mohammadan opinion in this Province is opposed to the Congress propaganda. The only two notable Mohammadan gentlemen who have been associated with the Congress in the Punjab are (1) Sheikh

1. Originally published as letter to the Editor, *The Panjabee* (Lahore), 15 July 1909.

Umar Bux, B A., Pleader, Chief Court, and (2) Maulvi Muharram Ali Chishti. I do not know if the latter has joined the Reception Committee, but the former has, though he is very strongly in favour of a "United Congress." I have taken some pains to ascertain Hindu opinion in the Province and I am in a position to say that the best Hindu opinion is opposed to holding the next session at Lahore. Their reasons, however, differ. It is a base calumny and a dishonest party trick to suggest that they are influenced by "extreme" politics. Some (whose opinions are voiced by Mr. "Observer") think that the Congress demands are impossible and that by putting forward these demands the Congress has prejudiced the Hindu community in the eyes of the Government. To attribute extreme views to them is nothing more than a mean party dodge. The Hindu public opinion of the Province is thus hopelessly divided. The following leading Hindus are opposed to holding the next session at Lahore : Rai Bahadur Lala Lal Chand, R.B. Lala Shadi Lal, Bar-at-Law, Rai Sahib Lala Sukh Dyal, Rai Bahadur Bakshi Sohan Lal, Rai Sahib Lala Murli Dhar, Lala Kanhaya Lal of Amritsar, Lala Hansraj Sawhney of Rawalpindi, Lala Amolak Ram, Bhagat Ishwar Das, Lala Dwarka Das, Lala Amar Das of Sialkot, Lala Duni Chand, Secretary, Indian Association, Lala Nanak Chand, Bar-at-Law; Treasurer, Indian Association.

I have only mentioned some leading names from amongst those who have at sometime or other taken some sort of active interest in the affairs of the Congress and have never openly opposed it on any occasion.

I am further in a position to state that Pandit Rambhaj Dutt Chaudhri has not joined and does not perhaps intend to join the Reception Committee on the ground that since the invitation at Madras was given, circumstances have altered to justify a change in his opinion. I have his own statement that Congress should not be held at Lahore this year. I have reason to believe that Sir P.C. Chatterji also holds similar views and has positively declined to join the Reception Committee. I have also taken steps to sound some gentlemen at Rawalpindi, Jhelum, Shahpur, Gujranwala, Gurdaspur, Hoshiarpur and Lyallpur, and so far as my information goes, the leading men at every centre are opposed to holding the Congress at Lahore in December next. At Ferozepore opinion is divided. At Ambala the only man of note who is not opposed to the Congress

being held in the Punjab is Pandit Madho Ram, though I am not quite certain if he even has joined the Reception Committee yet. The bulk of others are strongly opposed and so is, I am told, Mr. Alakhdhari of Ambala Cantonment, who was to a large extent the life and soul of the last provincial Conference at Ambala. It is true that these gentlemen are not agreed on the grounds of their opposition, but that they are opposed to the holding of the next session at Lahore, there can be no doubt of. Besides that no one can deny that the influence of the Congress in the past was not confined to those who could openly attend its meetings. The vast mass of Hindu officials, low and high, sympathised with it and their sympathy was a valuable asset that contributed to its success. It is an open secret now that the vast body of Hindu officials in the Punjab are under the influence of a wave of reaction and feel no enthusiasm for the Congress.

Under the circumstances may I ask, if it is wise to insist on the next session being held at Lahore ? I do not doubt the capacity of the Reception Committee to make arrangements for the proposed meeting at Lahore, but then the result obtained will be too disproportionate to the price which will have to be paid for it—not in the shape of money but in the shape of bitterness which will result thereby. Already one has begun to hear of the pressure that is being brought by both sides on individuals to join or not to join the Reception Committee. One should have thought that the Congress aimed at uniting people and was pledged not to do anything which had any tendency to widen the gulf already existing between different sections of the Indian community. On page 8 of the Report of the First National Congress are given the objects which the founders set before them when they started the Congress :

(a) The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in our country's cause in the parts of the Empire.

(b) The eradication by direct friendly personal intercourse of all possible race, creed, or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of our country, and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in their beloved Lord Ripon's ever-memorable reign

(c) The authoritative record after this has been carefully elicited by the fullest discussion of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day.

(d) The determination of the lines upon and methods by which during the next twelve months it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public interests.

In the third report again we find the objects authoritatively expounded on pages 2 to 5. The first and the most important object was "the fusion into one national whole of all the different and till recently discordant elements that constitute the population of India." On page 5 it was stated that it was the object of the Congress "to unify public opinion by the interfusion of the views held by all classes in all the various provinces, and eliminating matters, sectional and provincial, to arrive at definite and *unanimous conclusion* on all truly national questions." The italics are mine. Now with the experience of the last two years one may very well pause to consider if the methods that are being followed to limit the Congress to a particular party of the educated Hindus are in furtherance of the above object. Before proceeding further, however, let me state it in the clearest possible language that I do not impugn the motives of any of the leaders of the Congress on either side. For Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and Mr. Gokhale, I have the highest respect and admiration. Sir P. Mehta, I consider, to be the ablest, the most consistent and, in his environments, the most courageous of Indian politicians. Mr. Gokhale's partiotism and high-mindedness are above suspicion. To doubt his sincerity will be denying the existence of any sincerity in the country. But even holding these opinions, one may honestly doubt the *wisdom* of the policy that has been persistently followed since the unfortunate split of 1907. No one deplores the scenes of Surat more than I do. I have reason to think that no one deplored them more than the man who was held to be directly responsible for it by the country. Mr. Tilak's chief fault (for which he is paying the penalty of transportation) was that, instead of leading his party, he allowed himself to be led by some of its wild spirits. Twice on my request, at Surat, he agreed to waive his opposition to the election of Dr. Rash Behari Ghose and leave the matter of the four Calcutta Resolutions to the Subjects Committee,[1] but the moment I left him he found himself helpless before the volume of opinion that surrounded him. But

while this is true, that Mr. Tilak's party was directly responsible for the scenes, can any one deny that the leaders of the other side were also *anxious* to bring about the split, and that had they been in a different mood, their resourcefulness could have avoided it ? I am of opinion that the best interests of the country demand, that the party called "Moderate" should retain the actual control and management af the Congress ; but that the other party should remain inside the Congress, and should exercise its influence in the way in which all strong minorities do. It was under the influence of that opinion that joining the Convention I gave out my intention of working towards a reconciliation.[2] It did not take me long, however, to find out that my attempts in that direction were considered to be presumptuous and so I had to drop them at an early stage. Since then all attempts to bring about a re-union made by well-intentioned friends on both sides have been contemptuously repulsed and at present there seems to be no prospect of success in case of their renewal. To a man of my humble understanding it means that the moderate "Nationalists" are committing an error of tactics in making the split a "settled fact."

There was, and there is, absolutely no chance of the politics of Sir Mehta and Mr. Gokhale being misunderstood by their associating once in a year with a party of politicians who hold advanced views. On the other hand, the presence of these latter in the same organisation is calculated to add to the power and the influence of the former. As at present, the other party has well nigh been crushed. It is silly and preposterous to charge Mr. Gokhale with having brought about the transportation of Mr. Tilak.[3] No sane man can believe it. But all the same it cannot be denied that the split of 1907 and the persistent refusal of the Moderates to make up, have materially contributed to the extinction of the so-called "Extremists." The failure of the Moderates to protest against the high-handed action of the C. P. Government in prohibiting their meeting also goes against them. So far as political foresight is concerned, I may not be worthy of even loosening the latchets of the shoes of the Moderate leaders, but I am emphatically of opinion that the extinction of the extreme left wing of the Indian National party is a grave menace to the Congress itself. The Moderate leaders may discover it when it is too late. I am inclined to think that with the change of Government in England their position as advocates of

Colonial Self-Government for India will become untenable. Already the wind has begun to blow in that direction. In his second speech in the House of Lords delivered on the 26th of February, while moving the second reading of the Indian Councils Bill, Lord Morley gave a gentle hint to that effect. Be however as it may, it is clear that at present there are no chances of the two parties re-uniting on the same political platform. I know from experience how difficult it is to bring about a re-union after a split has actually taken place. With mutual mistrust reigning supreme in the minds of both, it is really difficult to forget the past and again become one. Still I seriously doubt the right and title of the Moderate party to sail under the name of the "Indian National Congress". The latter, as it was known to the country from 1887 to 1907, has ceased to exist. The Convention had no right or title to make a constitution for the old Indian National Congress. It could only recommend one which, when adopted by the latter, even by a majority of votes, would have established its right to continue its old life. Personally I make no secret of the opinion that the principles as settled by the Allahabad Convention are the only principles on which the Congress can be run as such, but what I cannot bring myself to accept is the high-handed precedent of fastening the Constitution on those who had no legal hand in framing it, and that too in the name of the old organisation. However, taking the situation as it is, the split reduces the position of the Congress to an organisation run by a section of the educated Hindus in the name of the united nation. The bulk of the Mohammadans are opposed to it. A strong section of the Hindus disown its politics, being disposed to a policy of reaction. The majority have, since the split, become indifferent. The minority that still stand for a propaganda of Self-Government are divided Under the circumstances it is futile to pretend that the Congress stands condemned by the mouth of its own leaders who have given an unqualified support to the despatch of the Government of India, embodying the principle of separate denominational representation and an excessive representation to a minority on the ground of their 'political importance.'[4] Under the circumstances it may perhaps be wise to declare a halt, in order to enable us to examine our circumstances, husband our resources and get time for calm thinking and sound planning.

Should the Congress then be wound up ? Certainly not. For some time the annual demonstrations may be given up and the standing Indian Committee and the British Committee may be maintained or the demonstration may be held in provinces where there is a practical unanimity of opinion, at least among the educated Hindus. Coming nearer home, we find that the Hindus of this Province are rightly indignant at their defeat. Give them time to think and to study. Let them try, if they are so disposed to do, other methods of regaining their lost position. Don't provoke them into hostility, don't create further splits, don't add further bitterness into the already bitter situation, don't make a "hell" of public life, in places where it is a weak and tender plant unable to stand an abnormal trial of strength. In times of national emergeney, it is better that reason should rule over sentiment. In December last when certain Punjab delegates invited the Congress to Lahore,the situation was different. It has since then materially altered. There is no dishonour involved in changing our plans in accordance with the changed exigencies of the situation. Time is a great healer. It is not a despicable factor in national developments. Let us coolly depend upon its beneficient intervention, at the same time strenuously carrying on the work of nation-building in directions less open to strong differences of opinion amongst educated circles and less open to misconstruction by Government. It is better to work in an humble spirit than to lay down wrong principles. When there is no unity and can be none, it is better not to provoke active hostility between the parties by an attempt at forced union. At the present moment not only any attempt to speak in the joint names of Hindus and Mohammadans will be strongly resented by the former, but any attempt to speak in the name of the majority of the Hindus will also find an emphatic repudiation.

My friends of the U.P. have in more than one paper and on more than one occasion taunted me with allowing personalities to interfere in the discharge of a public duty. I do not claim to be above personal considerations, but I think the advice might more profitably have been offered to more weighty people whose personalities have, by influencing their principles, wrecked a national organisation. We, in this Province, have our own weaknesses, but I do not think any other Province can show us a candle in that respect, unless inaction and absence of vigour in public life are virtues which any

one need justifiably be proud of. Vigour in life is bound to bring about certain amount of irritation and friction, and no one need be alarmed at it so long as that friction and irritation are not the all-consuming forces of life and not form an insurmountable obstacle to progress. The friction and party spirit in the Arya Samaj, if looked in that light, need not alarm any of our well-wishers ; not that I hold it as an example to be followed or that I justify it, but because, so far as the Samaj is concerned, it has, in several respects, added to its usefulness and influence.

22. THE MISSION OF THE ARYA SAMAJ

LET ME most sincerely thank you for the honour you have conferred upon me by asking me to preside over your deliberations this year.

I had at first some hesitation in accepting your kind offer, not because I had any doubts about the importance of your organization or the usefulness of your propaganda, but because I felt doubtful of my own fitness for the task. In my opinion, one of the most important and arduous duties of a public man in India is to initiate the youth of the country into the trials and responsibilities of public life and direct their energies into such course as may lead them to success without stranding them on the rocks of uncontrolled exuberance or shoals of apathy and indolence. The religious, social and political conditions of the country are so complex that it is impossible to find a parallel to them in the history of any other nation. I do not know if any of the other great countries of the world ever had to pass through so many vicissitudes. Of all the ancient civilizations of the world,--the Greek, the Roman, the Egyptian, the Persian and the Babylonian, none enjoyed such a vast and varied sphere of influence as the ancient civilization of the Aryans of India, none presented such a great variety of ethnological, anthropological, linguistic and religious types. Our country is practically an epitome of the world. There is no physical condition, climatic or otherwise, which is not represented in the extensive length and breadth of our Fatherland. From the eternally snow-clad hills of the mighty Himalaya to the sunbaked thirsty plains of Rajputana and Sind there is no shade of climate which is not represented in India. From the most primitive animism of the aborigines to the highly abstract and

Address delivered by Lala Lajpat Rai as President of the third All India Arya Kumar Sammelan, held at Saharanpur, U. P., on 18 and 19 October, 1912. Reproduced from *The Tribune*, 24 October 1912.

transendental monism of the Vedanta, there is no phase of religious thought which does not find its exponent in this land. The same may be said about the social usages, rites and practices of the various communities, and the character and habits of individuals. Yet with all these differences and varieties there is a sense of unity running through all this multiplicity. The vast bulk of our population (both Hindu and Mohammadan) belong to one race. The blood that flows in their veins is mostly of one and the same Aryan stock. Whether you go to the north or south, east or west, there is no mistaking the preponderant Aryan features of the population. The spoken language of the vast bulk of the population, whether Hindu or Mohammadan, has the same common origin. Even the Dravidian languages give ample evidences of the Aryan influence. In the matter of religion, however, there seems to be a variety, though even there, the peculiar readiness of Hinduism to absorb and assimilate every form of religious belief into its system renders that difference less marked and less real. Add to this the unifying influences that have been at work during the last century. Of them the most potent and the most effectual is English education for which our best thanks are due to those liberal English statesmen who voted for its introduction into India Modern education imparted through the medium of English has its own drawbacks and has done us harm in several respects, but no fair-minded person can deny its beneficent results so far as the process of unification is concerned. A common system of education has brought about a feeling of community of interests in the different provinces of India, and has materially helped to strengthen the national feeling. This does not mean that counter-acting forces have been altogether silent. We have had to contend against various dividing, separating and disintegrating forces that have been at play simultaneously with the unifying influences. It is the conflict of these forces, antagonistic, real, living, ever present and ever working that makes our position so difficult and complex. It is this which renders public life in this country a matter of such grave responsibility and of such serious consequences. The mere difference of race, language and religion is more or less present in every modern state. The American States furnish the most outstanding examples of such divergences and conflicts. Even Great Britain is not altogether free of them. Yet nowhere, either in the past or in the present, there is any parallel to the complex character of the Indian situation. The great problem of life in India is how to harmonise these divergent

and conflicting elements so that the forces of unification may have their full play unhampered and unchecked by the various cross-currents of Indian public life. The problem is puzzling to the most sanguine optimist and is discouraging to the most robust of Indian nationalists. Yet it has to be done and carried through and so far as possible with the least possible friction among the various constituents of the body politic. The work is difficult enough even for grown up people who have spent the better part of their lives in public service and it is much more so for you who are on the threshold of worldly careers. You may have the fire, the enthusiasm, the zeal, and the earnestness of youth in you but this is not enough to ensure success as public men. You must also possess that sobriety of judgment, soundness of views and propriety of action which is born of experience and discipline. To say the right word and do the right thing at the right moment is what secures distinction for a public man in the public life of his country. It falls to the lot of few to achieve that distinction, yet that is the goal towards which every one of you, who aspires to serve his country ought to strive. The fact that ours is a movement, which is, in a way sectarian in its nature and which includes religious propaganda of a definite kind in its programme, adds to the difficulties of the situation. But difficulties or no difficulties, the situation must be faced with manliness and full sense of responsibility. Shirking or avoiding one's responsibilities because of difficulties will not make the situation easier. All these considerations lead me to accept the position you so kindly offered me.

None of you, Arya Kumars, should forget the anomalous and awkward situation in which circumstances have placed us and which require extreme care and good sense from all those who take it upon themselves to reform and ennoble public life in India. Now to come to the definite work before us. Let us first understand our position clearly. The movement of the Arya Samaj, with which the Arya Kumar Sabhas are so closely connected, has a double mission. It is humanitarian as well as national. The Arya Samaj is humanitarian in so far as it aims at making men and women better, more truth loving and nobler. The Samaj believes in certain truths which it preaches in all its sincerity to mankind in general without any distinction of creed, colour or climate. It believes in a certain type of civilization, the propagation of which will, in its opinion, benefit

mankind in general and add to their progress in the spiritual and on the moral plane and also to their physical happiness. The Arya Samaj believes that the Vedic religion affords the best solution of world's difficulties and is best calculated to promote better understanding between man and man. As such, the mission of the Arya Samaj is world-wide and makes no distinction between one nationality and another. But intimately and inseparably connected with this mission is the task of reforming and regenerating the people who have from times immemorial believed in the teachings of the Vedas and in whose veins courses the ancient blood of the Rishis that formulated and developed the Aryan civilisation, which is at once the wonder and glory of the world. These people are the Hindus, and the Arya Samaj, as such, has special obligations towards them. In this sense the mission of the Arya Samaj is "national". As a movement that is pledged to liberty of conscience and liberty of thought, as a movement that aims at a just and humane social system, as a movement that tends to destroy all bondage whether of mind or of body, the Arya Samaj has clear distinct mission to the land of its birth and the people of that land. Even the bitterest enemy of the Arya Samaj cannot deny that it is one of the greastest liberalising and uplifting agencies in the country. And as such it wields a potent influence in developing, strengthening and purifying national sentiment. There is no reason why we should deny this or be afraid of owning this phase of our work. Its influence is beneficently restraining. From the very nature of its religious teaching it can never lend its support to lawlessness or anarchy. It believes in and advocates discipline of mind and body, discipline in private life and discipline in public life, discipline in solitude and discipline in worldly life, in short, an all round life of discipline and self-control. As such it restrains all violent eruptions and outbursts. The Arya Samaj stands for solid progress and it realizes that in the prevailing conditions of Indian public life, the rate of progress cannot but be slow. It is useless to deny that it has a strong nationalising influence with a religious mission all embracing and universal. It has a social mission which from the very nature of its teachings tends to strengthen and solidify all those who revere the Vedas and accept them as their scriptures, and are not only proud of what at the present day goes by the name of Hindu culture but sincerely mean to stand by that culture and make it the basis of their future greatness. This part of ts mission renders it liable to misapprehension and mis-presentation.

Our Muslim friends call it anti-Muslim, our Christian friends characterise it as anti-Christian and the thoughtless Jingoes sometimes denounce it as anti-British. As a matter of fact, it is nothing of the sort. It is a pure and simple Hindu movement. Some of my Arya Samajist friends do not like that name but I do not agree with them and have no hesitation in calling it a body of Hindus. The Arya Kumar Sabha, being a product of the Arya Samaj, cannot in essence, be very different from the parent institution. The name "Arya Kumar Sabha" indicates the limitations of the society. It is a society composed of young men who believe in the world-wide mission of the Arya Samaj inclusive of the obligations which it has towards Hindus and Hindustan in particular. Young Aryas constitute themselves into these Arya Kumar Sabhas with the object of getting a training which may in due time fit them for the higher, the more extensive and the more responsible work of the main Samaj.

The Arya Kumar Sabhas are in the nature of Schools where young men receive training to fit them for the higher life of the University. viz., the Samaj. As such the first thing that is necessary for an Arya Kumar is to have a preliminary *grounding* in the religious teachings of the Arya Samaj. This does not at all imply that he should encumber his mind with all the subtle niceties of religious philosophy nor is it advisable for him to give too much importance to the controversial side of religion. What should be quite sufficient in his case is that he should know the broad truths of the Vedic religion, particularly those characteristics of it which distinguish it from the other principal religions of the world. He should have the attitude of a seeker after truth and cultivate a receptive frame of mind so as to grasp whatever of truth and genuine good qualities come in his way. I am very strongly of opinion that a young man studying religion ought to avoid the habit of mind which results in affection of religion. Some young men begin to imitate the pose of religious men simply because they have read a few books on religion or because they have taken to conform themselves to the outer forms of religion. To my mind this impairs the development of a true religious spirit and as such I deprecate the premature encouragement of a spirit of religious controversy or empty observances of ritual in youths, and much more do I deprecate attempts to thrust controversial religion down the throats of boys and girls before they have grown into men and women. I am very strongly in favour of a few

broad general religious truths being included in the school education of every boy and girl, but beyond that any attempt to introduce the subtleties of dogma in the scheme of studies is likely to injure the eventual development of manly frankness in them. There is no harm, nay it is desirable, if every Hindu boy and girl knows by heart a few select Vedic hymns singing the glory of God, laying an emphasis on the necessity of mutual goodwill and co-operation in social life, raising the dignity of womanhood and so on, but to initiate boys and girls into the mysticism of religion or into the intricacies of Vedanta is, in my humble opinion, positively harmful.

The ascetic tendencies of Hinduism are and have been very injurious to the development of manly vigour, and sturdy habits of life among Hindu youths and no effort to restrain and check those tendencies in the rising generations of the Hindu can be too great. In my judgment it is monstrous for boys and girls of immature age to engage in religious and theological polemics and in Yoga practices. Constantly to din into the ears of the boys and girls of the nation that this world is unreal, illusory or that secular things or secular interests are of no importance as against religious asceticism or the so-called higher life of *Vairagya*, is positively mischievous. It is only a mistaken view of life that would permit the placing of Upanishads into the hands of immature youths. The authors of the Upanishads never contemplated that their sincere and sublime attempts to solve the mysteries of life should be so unreservedly and indiscriminately placed in the hands of those who have neither mature judgment nor the developed faculty and experience of practical life, to appreciate them and to apply them to life.

Over and above this what is needed is that the beauties of the Hindu social culture should be explained with special emphasis on the abuses that have crept in the later days of darkness and ignorance and which require to be purged out. With this religious grounding and the mental equipment, what should be expected of Hindu youths is a clear and unequivocal conception of the absolute necessity and desirability of physical fitness for the battle of life. This covers the negative necessity of a pure "*Brahmcharya*" as well as the positive duty of doing every thing that is necessary to develope physical strength and fitness. One of the first duties of the Arya Kumar Sabhas should, therefore, be to interest themselves in the persons and bodies of the Arya Kumars. The senior among the

Arya Kumars should not only keep a vigilant eye on the moral character of their junior brethren but should use every possible means to encourage good healthy diet and manly games among their class and among Hindu youths in general. It is of great importance that Hindus should be made to feel a real interest in their diet. It will be foolish to try to copy the Western menu. What is necessary in the climate of the West, may be injurious to us in ours. But all the same it is necessary to learn from Englishman that diet is a matter of paramount importance to every man and woman desirous of playing a suitable part in life. It will not do to eat anything and everything that falls to your hand and at any time. Boys and girls must be made to change their tastes if necessary. At present the bane of Hindu dietary is an inordinate presence of taste for pungent and acid things. I have heard many parents complaining of their children preferring *chillies* and *khatai* to milk and butter. This is bad. Again the modern tendency of preferring English drinks (wines and aerated waters and tea and coffee) over milk and other less injurious, less costly and more nutritious Indian drinks such as *matha etc.* also requires to be checked. Hindu boys should be made to take greater interest in sports to feel pride in excellence in games. Unfortunately for us, boys in India are judged principally by their ability to pass examinations. While we want our boys to be diligent in their studies, success in examination or application in studies is not the only test of successful youths. It is high time that public opinion among the youth should assert itself and establish physical fitness as one of the primary qualifications of a successful young man. When talking on this subject one cannot ignore the fact that it is becoming rather fashionable for parents to encourage their boys to concentrate all their energies on passing examinations with distinction, sometimes even at the cost of their health. This is short sighted love and Hindu public opinion should now check it. Young men themselves may be perfectly justified in disregarding parental wishes if they find that the latter cannot be fulfilled without risk of injury to their health or without hampering their physical growth. This is one of those matters in which a revolt against parental coercion would be justified. So also in the matter of marriage. No Hindu youth should allow himself to be compelled to marry against his will nor should he allow his physical growth to be checked by the foolish desire of his parents to see him in wedlock at an early age.

The Arya Kumar Sabhas and the Young Men's Arya Samajes can do a great deal in this direction. Let all young men try to save themselves as well as their companions at school and at college from the disastrous results of child marriage. Every Arya Kumar Sabha should maintain a register of unmarried young men within their sphere of influence and their work ought to be judged by the number of prevented or postponed marriages among Hindu students. This is negative work. On the positive side the first duty of every Arya Kumur Sabha should be to have a play ground and encourage games and sports among Hindu youths. The educated and the uneducated should mix freely in games and sports, and in the play ground, all distinction of caste and social position should be ignored. Let there be a truc feeling of sportsmanship making physical fitness and excellence in sports the only test for regard and esteem on the play ground. The Arya Kumar Sabhas should organise wrestling matches, tournaments and other sporting events with the co-operation, goodwill and help of the grown up members of the community; their's should be the duty and responsibility of initiating and managing such tournaments and of keeping a constant, unfailing interest in sports. These matters may seem trifling to some people but I attach great importance to them. The greatest need of the Hindu boys of today is the prolongation of the period of their boyhood. To let the responsibilities of manhood fall on a youth before he is even an adult is to check his physical growth and strangle his ambition. The curse of early marriage and the anxiety to pass a number of examinations has shattered the health of many a promising youngman and rendered his life miserable and profitless.

2. The second duty which I would like to impose on the Arya Kumar Sabhas is the duty of quietly and unostentatiously helping those poor students whom poverty forces to economise in the matter of food.

3. It should also fall within the province of Arya Kumar Sabhas to provide healthy and useful reading for young men. This can be done by organising small circulating libraries for the use of young men.

4. The protection of boys and girls from the rowdies and *Badmashes* is another useful work which the members of the Arya Kumar Sabhas should put their hands to.

5. In the case of the large Arya Kumar Sabhas it would be useful to have "Social Service Sub-Committees" or Sewak Mandalies for the nursing of the sick and helping of the needy among the young men of the society. The members of the different Arya Kumar Sabhas all over India should feel as if they are members of one family and deeply interested in one another. For this purpose they must have their own homes in important towns.

So far I have confined myself to a general brief outline of the work of the Arya Kumar Sabhas in their relation to young men, because I am disposed to think that this should be the most important plank in their platform. In fact this is the proper and the most legitimate sphere of work for them. An Arya Kumar who fails to do his duty towards other Arya Kumars, can hardly be considered a fit person to enter the larger life of the Arya Samaj. But this by no means implies that the Arya Kumar Sabhas be totally isolated and self-satisfied. Closely allied with their obligations towards the Arya Kumars, they have a distinct duty towards the parent Samaj of co-operating with the latter in the fulfilment of its mission to the extent of their own means and ability. For example it is the duty of the Arya Kumar Sabhas to be helpful to the main body on the occasion of their anniversaries, in keeping order in meetings, in dispensing hospitality to the guests of the Samaj and so on. The Arya Kumar Sabhas can be very helpful in the work of social uplift, in disseminating the principles of social reform, in bringing elementary education to the depressed classes, in famine relief work, in distributing medicines, *etc.* in times of epidemics, in distributing the literature of the Arya Samaj and in popularising its institutions. But in order to do their work efficiently it is necessary for them to have the goodwill and sympathy of the main body and that object can only be achieved if the relations between the two are not only cordial but in a sense resembling those of a parent and child. Good and wise parents know what and how far to assert their authority. Every parent should help his child to be self-reliant and self-supporting, subject to the latter's readiness to be controlled in his conduct whenever the parents desire to assert their right of control in the child's own interest. There is no room for jealousy in the relations of a parent and child. The anology is not quite apt in this case but will do for all practical purposes. I am of opinion that in their own sphere, *i.e.*, in their work in relation to the Arya Kumar Sabhas, the

Arya Kumar Sabhas should be quite independent of the main Samaj, but in other work they should always work not only in harmony with, but in subordination to, the parent body. Much, however, will depend on the good sense of tl e officers of the Samaj. No amount of paper constitution or rules or bye-laws can be of any use unless they are worked in the right spirit. This latter is more or less a matter of personal equation. There are chances of friction and discordance between the main Samaj and the Arya Kumar Sabhas, in stations where the former is a dormant body and the latter active and energetic. The best interests of the country require that both should be sufficiently active within their respective spheres. An inactive, lifeless Samaj should have no reason to complain if the Arya Kumar Sabha by its activities begins to overshadow it. After all it is a question of vitality. An institution which has no vitality will have, in the ordinary course of nature, to make room for another which puts forth life and vigour in its movements. Nature visits the tepid and the lifeless with extinction. There is no choice between life and death. The Samajes that want to maintain their position in the public life of the country, must live an active life. If they fail to do so, they must not grumble and make it a grievance that they are neglected and ignored. In fact they must not wonder if they are displaced and superseded by more active and living agencies.

From the very nature of things the constitution and the condition of every Kumar Sabha must depend on local conditions and circumstances. It is neither necessary nor wise to lay down any hard and fast rules. The thing needed to keep a living link between the different Kumar Sabhas is a central body, which should advise and guide the Sabhas in matters which are not peculiarly local. Modern conditions require that every living movement should have an office and if possible an organ to formulate its views and discuss its special policy. The former need not be very expensive nor need the latter be very ambitious. Yet a General Secretary, a paid and a whole-time man, if possible, with a clerk to help him in the carrying on of correspondence, is the least that is required and there should be no difficulty in finding out the necessary funds for such a modest office.

I think, gentlemen, I have touched upon most of the important points that require consideration and elucidation at this stage of you

movement. In the end I would like to impress upon you the sacredness of public duty. No man is really great and good who is solely devoted to the pursuit of selfish ends. No nation can be great the component parts of which suffer from a lack of public spirit. *No one can be truly religious* who does not feel that the service of God's creatures is the highest and the most sacred of a man's obligations.

In the words of the great Christian divine Dean Farrer "there are two mighty and noble feelings which may sway the human heart, one, the pity for individual suffering, the pity which, like the little new born-babe, sits in the heart of a John Howard or a Vincent de Paul, the other, the passionate indignation for human wrongs. There are souls which feel wounded when reason is wounded; which, moved by a lofty and masculine sensibility, are keenly alive to the mighty interests of order, justice and human dignity. The spirit of man plunged in ignorance and error, liberty of person fettered, liberty of conscience strangled, just perverted, innocence oppressed, reason hurled down by violence, multitudes crushed by a selfish despotism,—these are the wrongs which fill their souls with flames. And what are these but violations of the Christian law, "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you," violations of that holy law on a vaster scale, and transferred from the individual to the social sphere." "Darkly and terribly guilty are all they," says the same divine, "who are living in wilful and constant violation of God ; all they—every one of them—who sell themselves to do evil, who *work all* uncleanness with greediness ; who call evil good and good evil, who are gaining their livelihoods in ways which demoralize or degrade or defraud their neighhour ; *Guilty* also are all those—and they are many—who, without active and flagrant immorality, live only to the world or to the flesh ; selfish, egoistical, indifferent, caring only for their own comfort or interest, shut up amid their own refinements and indulgences, heedless of the bowing winds which wrestle on the great deep without, and of the multitudes who are being helplessly swallowed up in those wild waves. *Less guilty*, yet still needing to be aroused to nobler aims, are the multitudes who, though not useless, not immoral, yet too blind to the solemn responsibilities which God lays upon us all, raise no finger outside the circle of their own narrow domesticities to make the world happier or better.

"*Least guilty*, yet not wholly to be acquitted, are those who do

love and pity their suffering fellowmen, but, folding their hands in mute despair before the perplexities of life's awful problems, need to be fired with fresh energies and brighter hopes".

Arya Kumars, need I tell you to which of these categories the vast bulk of our people including ourselves belong. The founder of the Arya Samaj, an ascetic who had been brought up in a school which propounded that highest bliss lay in "Self-realisation" without any relation to the world outside, found by long study and experience that we had misunderstood the teachings of our ancestors on the subject of Self-realisation and the "Self-realisation" preached by the vast number of Sadhus and Sanayasis going about in the country was nothing but consecrated or magnified selfishness and that it had destroyed the grand structure of social and public duties which had been reared by our ancestors in their Shastras for the good of the individual and the society. The *Varna Ashram Dharma* had been completely undermined, misinterpreted and misused. He, therefore, exhorted us back to the old ideals of duty and laid the foundations of a splendid public life by inaugurating the Arya Samaj. His clarion voice having been stilled for a time, we are perhaps again falling into the old state of self-seeking *omne torpor* and adding to the volume of our guilt. The Arya Samaj is getting very few recruits. The young men turned out by the universities are showing signs of a deplorable relapse to the old state of callous ease and selfish optimism.

"The attitude of some—let us hope the very few—is *simply not to care at all*; to live in pleasure on the earth, and be wanton; to have hearts as fat as brawn and cold as ice, and hard as the nether mill stone; to heap up superfluous and often ill-gotten wealth, to be hoarded in acquisition, squandered in luxury or reserved for the building up of idle families.

"The attitude of others is that of a *scornful pity, half despairing*. The attitude of others, again, is *foolish acquiescence*. They are weary of the whole thing; sick of hearing anything about it. It annoys them. Tell them of it, and they shrug their shoulders with an impatient "what can we do? Ask them for help, and they have "so many claims" that they practically give to none. Press the claim, and they resent it as a personal insult. Suggest a plan, and they will call it "utopian." Describe a case of anguish, and they will call you "sensational." Take part in a public effort and they will sneer at

you as "self-advertising." The one thing they believe in is selfish *laisses faire.* Things will last their time and that is all they care about. They grow too indolent and too selfish to care about anything but their own indulgences and their own ease.

"The attitude of others is at least a *tender if a somewhat despairing pity.* They would fain stretch out a helping hand if they knew how. They say with the good Bishop of Wakefield :

O brother, treading over darkening ways.
O sister, whelmed in ever-deepening care.
Would God we might unfold before your gaze
Some vision of the pure and true and fair !
Better to know, though sadder things be known ;
Better to see, though tears half filled the sight,
Than thraldom to the sense, and heart of stone,
And horribler contentment with the right.

"And how can we be blamed if, indeed our individual pity does take a tinge of despair ? Almost every week there come to my door men, perfect strangers asking for money or asking me to find them work. What can I, what can any man do, for such cases ? To find work is of course impossible ; to give money to all such chance mendicants is not only impossible, but would merely feed the sources of misery and do positive harm. The case lies wholly beyond the reach of such isolated and often pernicious almsgiving. It needs the brave effort of a whole nation. It needs the courageous self-denial of the whole church. It needs the hearty co-operation of all true men."*

The work is difficult, uphill, full of risks and dangers, yet there is no escape from it. The times have changed, and escape from pain and sorrow by sheer resignation can no longer be held to be the proper object of life. In the words of Huxley :—

"We have long since emerged from the heroic childhood of our race, when good and evil could be met with the same 'frolic welcome'; the attempts to escape from evil. Whether Indian or Greek, have

*This a quotation from a writing of Dean Farrer which I have bodily adopted as it suits my purpose.

ended in flight from the battlefield ; it remains to us to throw aside the youthful over confidence and the no less youthful discouragement of nonage ; we are grown men, and must play the man.

strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield, cherishing the good that falls in our way, and bearing the evil, in and arround us, with stout hearts set on diminishing it. So far we all may strive in one faith towards one hope :

It may be that the gulfs will work us down,
It may be we shall touch the happy Isles,
.........But something ere the end,
Some work of noble note may yet be done."

23. THE PROBLEM OF THE DEPRESSED CLASSES

THE PROBLEM of the Depressed Classes can be studied in three aspects. We can look upon it from the point of view of the Hindu community. We can regard it as an Indian question or we can consider it in its humanitarian bearings.

1. THE HUMAN ASPECT

The present age is usually regarded as an age of equality and brotherhood ; the world is moving ever faster towards the realisation of democracy. Thinking men fix their attention on the masses and no longer think merely of the wealthy and the powerful ; man has truly become the centre of all thought in social and economic matters. Human improvement has increasingly become the main occupation in the studies of social philosophers and economists. How to raise the working classes, and specially the submerged masses of humanity to the dignity of manhood and how to secure to them the comforts and conveniences of civilization is without doubt the acknowledged search, equally of the politician and the student. In the many strifes between nations, and the struggles of political parties, and in the keen rivalry of trade that is all around us, the mind of man forgets not for a day the paramountcy of the intense social question. The whole burden of modern civilization and today's social science is to level down the barriers that separate men into groups and lead to social friction ; and in their place establish a sense of human solidarity with all its accompaniments of brotherly love, fellow-feeling and human sympathy. Such is the pivot on which the thoughts of the great thinkers of Europe and America turn today. But the forces of selfishness, of greed, of pride and insolence are not easy to knock down, and offer the most

Speech by Lala Lajpat Rai as President of the Depressed Classes Conference at Gurukul Kangri. Reproduced from *The Tribune*, 21-22 May 1913.

serious obstacle to the carrying out in practice of the great conclusions of calm and dispassionate scientific thinking—for how otherwise are we to account for the bitter rivalries and the terrible wars that still go on unchecked every year in some part or another of civilised Christendom. The people of Europe have ceaselessly tried to remove these fatal obstacles during the last four hundred years, but they remain rooted in human weakness. Many changes, no doubt, have taken place in the mutual dealings of the great independent nations ; the hand of cordiality has been extended where bitter animosity raged before. And among the civilized people of the world, between the nobility and the commons, the educated and the uneducated, the rich and the poor, the landlord and the tenant, the capitalist and the workman, the governing and the governed, not the same differences exist today which divided them a hundred years ago. But differences remain still, the battle rages yet—and the stalwarts of these races inspired by true national spirits are banded to efface these marks of division and strife. It may be impossible to obliterate all differences between man and man, it would be against nature for men not to start with radical differences in body, mind and natural gifts, and this means necessary disparity of conditions ; but the disparity need not be so much as has hitherto existed. With greater equality of opportunity the grosser differences are bound to vanish.

The world need not be divided into millionaires on one side, and the hungering proletariat on the other ; nor need there be the sharp grouping between the learned and the totally illiterate. Sharp divisions must go till we feel towards each other as brother men, the sense of personality and the consciousness of humanity deepened, and man realises the new dispensation of mutual love and respect. No man may lay down the law for another despotically, no one may take advantage of the poverty or ignorance of his fellow being. The Western nations are constantly striving in their legislation to achieve these ends. They have already incorporated with greater or less completeness the following important principles in their laws.

1. Every person whether male or female has the right to receive at State expense at least such elementary education as would enable him to earn his livelihood, or make use of opportunities for advance. In many countries of Europe, every child has

the right to receive free education upto a particular age, and some governments have made this primary education even compulsory so that the parents may not possibly by neglect or otherwise deprive their children of this great birth-right of man. In addition every student has ample opportunities to prosecute his studies according to his special aptitudes irrespective of his being rich or poor. The result is that knowledge and learning which were once the monopoly of the few have now broken these bounds and become the property of every one. And today from the humble and the poor rise such men of learning and efficiency who command respect not only from the great and rich men of their own country but receive universal homage in the world. The gates of Universities once open only to the rich and the influential now stand wide open to all. Seats of learning exist in every town of importance, and scholarships and medals are established to encourage and stimulate research. Among those who adorn the professional chairs in the Universities are men who but yesterday belonged to the unnoticed lower classes, some perhaps occupied a position in society not much better than that of our depressed classes.

2. In several countries of Europe, it is being recognised that every person has the right to obtain such wages as would secure him not merely ordinary means of livelihood, but also some comforts of life. Every man should have some leisure for study and travel ; he should be able to take interest in national questions, and take his part in problems of national advance. The day is gone when the rich could capriciously dictate terms to the worker and the wage-earner ; today the conditions of work are dictated by the wage-earner to the employer. Laws too impress upon the capitalist-employer the need of treating the workmen with consideration, and of studying the conditions of their comfort and happiness. Once the poor workman had to work even during illness to earn his bread ; today not only is ample provision made to look after the workman during sickness, but the State insures him against all expenditure during these periods of disability. The day too is past when the workmen in old age lived a life of harrowing misery and helpless starvation, now national exchequer opens its big purse to give them pensions in old age. Legislatures also secure to every workman some rest in the week, and society provides for the leisure hour, healthy reading rooms and clubs, pleasure-

gardens and big parks. Some time facilities for change of air and travel are also provided.

In short growing social consciousness and legislative activity are both working in the direction of securing to the poor that which was once possible to the rich alone. Much, no doubt, remains to be done, but in Europe big strides have been already made towards this defined goal.

3. The biggest step taken in Europe to remove the barriers between classes is the enlarged political franchise. Now the governing and the governed do not form two distinct classes, and the age of aristocracy is past and the rule by the rich and the propertied is long left behind. The middle classes who came after the propertied to control power have now given way to the dominating vote of the workman. The poor occupy the same position as the rich and the great. In the Parliament of England there sit now members who worked yesterday as ordinary wage earners in coal mines ; those command control in English administration who once hawked half-penny papers in the streets of London. And America and other European countries bear the same witness.

Such is indeed the true spirit of humanity, this is for what in truth the hundreds of missionaries of Christianity in all parts of the world are working. And it is for this great spirit that we appeal to our countrymen to pull down the barriers of bigotry, high-handedness, arrogance and pride, to abolish the bane of untouchableness from the millions of our fellow-beings, and allow them to rise according to their gifts and their merits without any artificial let or hindrance.

2. THE INDIAN POINT OF VIEW

Let us now consider the matter from the standpoint of the country. Our national gain consists obviously in this that our social and intellectual condition be improved. We are not prepared to admit that there is anything in the constitution of the Indian brains which would not permit of their achieving equal intellectual greatness with people of other races. The best Indian would compare favourably with the best European, though in sheer numbers India has very few first class men to her credit, and the average European is far superior to the average Indian, and the Europeans in the lowest rank of intelligence are infinitely superior

to the Indians in the same rank. Thus it is that the Indians are far behind the Europeans when looked at as aggregate peoples ; and it is not to be wondered at that small European States, with their limited numbers surpass the multitudinous population of this land in power and ability. And the social organization and administrative cohesion of the European peoples gives them an easy predominance over our teeming millions. Our national gain, therefore, clearly points to the paramount necessity of uplifting our vast masses in the scale of intellectual and social life. The sum of our national powers can never be large as long as one-fifth of our population is held in untouchable desecration by the remaining 4/5th. The local social position of the untouchable classes necessarily influences the condition of the higher classes. The higher Hindu Society today lives under the same degenerating influences as the early slave owners did. No one may crush another easily without paying heavily for wanton cruelty. Unless we are prepared to respect fellow men, and treat all as 'persons', we are only sowing the seeds of the destruction of our own self-respect and dignity. It is to be remembered that national decline has its origin in oppression upon others, and if we Indians desire to achieve national self-respect and dignity, we should open our arms to our unfortunate brothers of the depressed classes and help to build up in them the vital spirit of human dignity.

As long as we have these large classes of the untouchables in this country, we can make no appreciable progress in our national affairs, for this requires, a high moral standard, and a high sense of public morality is unthinkable where the weaker classes are unfairly treated. No man may build his greatness on foundation of his brother's weakness ; man shall stand or fall by his own strength.

The intelligent and powerful nations of Europe can only ook upon us with contempt, unless we are prepared at the very first to remove invidious class distinctions from our social fabric, and treat our fellow beings as respected brethren. We are today being pressed down by the dead-weight of the ignored depressed classes ; we must float or sink with them. In their strength is our strength and in their weakness our fall.

3. THE HINDU POINT OF VIEW

We cannot measure the power of peoples or communities by mere numbers ; much depends upon their internal constitution. It is often remarked that nations that are small in numbers but possess great cohesion and homogeneity are superior in power to nations that are large in numbers but lack homogeneity.

We have to examine the very constitution of our society if we wish to elevate and strengthen our community. No community can rise, split into discordant dividing factors.

There is no doubt that some divisions are certain to exist among big communities and large groups. The history of the world has no example to the contrary. The easiest and most efficient test of the power of nations is this that these divisions do not interfere with or lessen national power. The lines of cleavage and division should not run counter to the general lines of internal and external constitution. The divisions should be for facility of organization, expeditiousness of functioning, but not to violate the course of national development. No communities can advance unless they have in their constitution the material for combined action for common purposes ; no internal groupings should stand in the way of common action.

And the internal groupings should be based on justice ; any divisions turning upon injustice are bound to produce friction in the working of the great machine of the community and justice is more paramount than mere love or passion in this matter. The Hindus had established their caste system on a basis of work, merit and disposition ; the division was founded on justice and the needs and principles of the community. But afterwards the classification became purely a matter of birth, and very soon the true principles were perverted when the class entrusted with legislative work turned its power to its own selfish ends. In the true constitution of the caste system, ability and position went together, power and usefulness to community were in harmony, rights were measured by duties and responsibilities. It is only later that selfishness, shortsightedness, pride, and love of power vitiated the basic principles, and the human institution of castes was clothed with a divine sanction to the glory of the Brahman and the desecration of the Sudra. The natural result was the complete loss of

homogeneity among the Hindus, a complete loss of touch between the various sections of the great community.

Yet in spite of the cruel inequality with which the higher Hindu classes treat the lower classes, the faithfulness of these lower classes is really surprising; it indicates that man is largely a creature of habit. These lower classes tend to forget that they are being unjustly treated, and calmly bear up with their supposed lot. It is only when injustice exceeds all bounds that it becomes unbearable, and leads the oppressed into open defiance. And then as surely as a poison wrecks the human frame, injustice eats into the vitals of a race.

It is owing to the fact that injustice destroys self-respect and leads to a perverted sense of duty, that we have these disgraceful incidents so recently reported in newspapers.

In the Hoshiarpur District some Rajputs maltreated the Kabirpanthis most cruelly simply because they continued to occupy their beds in the presence of these august Rajputs. And for a similar offence in the Jammu territory the Brahmans placed a hot plate of iron on the body of a Vahisht caste Hindu. Such is the conduct of Rajputs swollen with the insolence of caste though they themselves do menial work, and wait at the tables and work in the kitchens of non-Hindus. These are the descendants of Pratap, Jaimal and Fatta, the valiant heroes of this chivalrous race. At Ludhiana, the municipality prohibited a Ramdasi Hindu from drinking water from the municipal tap; with one solitary exception Hindus and Mahomedans voted with one voice that so long as he remained a Hindu he cannot make use of the pipes though if he were to be converted to Islam or Christianity there would be no objection. To be a Hindu alone was the mark of disgrace for this poor being.

But the time for this cruel treatment of the depressed classes is now changed, for we have now in the country, societies whose hearts go forth in sympathy to these classes, and whose purses are ready to help them. Therefore, to-day the question is whether we Hindus are prepared to put aside our pride of caste and embrace in brotherly fold these poor brethren in whose veins courses the same blood as in ours; and thus build strength for ourselves; or are we going to let others take these into their own fold. Both

Mahomedans and Christians are equally prepared to uplift them by receiving them into their own faiths. During the last ten years more than a lakh and half of these depressed Hindus have changed their faith in the Punjab alone.

Those who believe in Hinduism and whose hearts feel for Hindu race must, therefore, place this problem in the very forefront of any programme of Hindu reform ; and spend their powers and their money in its solution. It is a problem which we can no longer put off even for a day, for delay is simply another name for losing these portions of our community from our ranks, there could be no possibility of our reclaiming them once they leave us for other faiths.

4. THE PRACTICAL ASPECT OF THE PROBLEM

The largest numerical magnitude of the untouchable classes exists only among the Hindus. No such distinction obtains among the Mahomedans and the Christians. The Prophet of Islam strongly forbode such distinctions, though Hindu ideas have produced some slight effect upon Mahomedans also. Is Hindu teaching then productive of these distinctions, is the untouchable a necessary consequence of Hinduism ?

We think not. However, we have according to the Census of 1901 nearly six crores among the depressed classes out of a total Hindu population of twenty-two crores. The figures of the recent Census are not complete, but we know that out of the eighty-eight lakhs of the Punjab Hiudus more than twenty-two lakhs belong to the untouchables ; and if such be the case in the Punjab, we may expect even worse facts in the other provinces. Such is the terrible fact that a fourth of our race lives under the fearful and disgraceful ban of untouchableness.

From the point of view of numbers the condition of Hindus causes much anxiety. While the numerical strength of the Christians and the Mahomedans is on the increase the Hindus are daily falling in numbers. During the last decade, in the Punjab the Hindus have gone down by fifteen per cent. and even if we allow for change due to a larger return of the Sikhs, the percentage of fall will be at the high figure of ten or eleven. During this decade over one and a half lakhs of Hindus were converted to Islam and Christianity; more than three fourths of them belonged to the depressed classes. Why

do they leave the Hindu fold : is it that they are attracted by the teachings of other religions, are they in a position to form any opinions as to the excellence or otherwise of religious dogma? The answer suggests itself easily ; the change of religion at once raises them in social position and worth, and hence the change. Hindus cannot keep these classes within their fold unless they are prepared to accord them a proper social position. This can be done in two ways : the first is to do away with the untouchableness; no one may be regarded as untouchable by the mere fact of being born in a particular caste ; there should be no prohibitions as to his admission to the Hindu temples ; the second is to raise them by education. Difficulties are obvious, many occupations have necessarily unpleasant duties, and these have been long associated in the Hindu mind with uncleanliness. There is something revolting to the high class Hindu in free association with people following these occupations. But these difficulties point to the necessity of calm and careful procedure ; the need for reform is imperative and must be boldly, though cautiously, undertaken. With a growing consciousness of the essential character of the Hindu interests we may look to effective handling of these difficulties.

So far the plans used to bring about the solution have been :

First, the need of purifying the untouchable classes has been explained to the Hindus by speeches and writings.

Second, the untouchables have been purified and made Aryas, which has enabled them to come to the Samajic temples and sit along with others ; and give them also the right of wearing the sacred thread ; some interdining has also been rendered possible ; arrangements for their education have to some extent been made ; and in some places a change of occupation for the young people of these classes has been made possible.

Third, in Bombay, Bengal and Madras, the Brahmo Samaj has established several institutions for them.

Fourth, the Khalsa (Sikhs) have also done something to purify their 'unclean' brethren.

5. WAKING UP

There is no doubt that in the educated circles of the country

there is considerable waking up to the gravity of the situation, and the educated Hindus are in general in sympathy with the uplifting of the depressed classes, But the conscience of the race has not been sufficiently touched yet. For this we want high class lecturers who can forcefully present this subject in its many aspects ; and impress through prose and verse the people at large with the imperativeness of the question.

Those in Northern India who are working in this cause have not yet made it the mission of their life. They only give occasional lectures actuated no doubt by a sense of duty but this is not enough. We want a definite and strong organization for this work alone. The problem is so serious, the need for early solution so imperious and some of its aspects so complicated that the work cannot, in my view, be undertaken, and I have given it the most earnest consideration, by the Arya Samaj or the Hindu Sabha as a part of their larger functions. We want a distinct organization for this definite work unencumbered with any religious propaganda or merely political ambitions. Comprehension and varied programme can be of little avail when we enter upon definite practical problems like the reclamation and uplifting of our unfortunate brethren of the depressed classes. At present the activity of the Arya Samaj is mainly centred upon educational work, and it is doubtful in view of the history and the tendency of the two sections of the Arya Samaj whether the work of purification can be best performed by them. Some Samajes are still doing *Shuddhi* work, but under present conditions this work can only proceed half-heartedly, the chief difficulty being that in both the parties of the Samaj they who best realise the gravity of the problem cannot act together in this matter.

The *Shuddhi* work requires a distinct and determined organization of its own in which all zealous Hindus may take their share unimpeded by other considerations. It is probable that in this organization much work will have to be done by the Samaj to which most of the educated members of the community at least in this province belong. A distinct organisation would secure for the work direct attention as compared with the subordinate position it now necessarily occupied in the Samajic programme ; the work would be free from the party strifes of the Samaj also.

The word *Shuddhi* is at present used in several senses; the *Shuddhi* of the untouchable classes; the *Shuddhi* of Hindu converts to Islam and Christianity; the *Shuddhi* of those born Mahomedans or Christians. In my view the organization for the purification of the untouchable classes should have nothing to do with the *Shuddhi* of non-Hindus. These two works are entirely distinct, and can be done in different ways, they differ in principle.

Turning to the method of *Shuddhi* we know that there are three steps in the Samajic mode of purification:

1. Shaving of the head; 2. Havan or sacrificial fire, and the teaching of Gayatri; 3. The assumption of the sacred thread. Some people think that to give the untouchables the sacred thread immediately on purification is against the principles of our religion and this opinion has some truth in it. But in my opinion there is no method so effective in raising these classes in the social scale as this; the sacred thread is an unmistakable symbol of purification. Put aside the sacred thread, and you lose all clear distinction between the purified and the non-purified. The sacred thread occupies an important place in the eye of the high caste Hindu and to invest the lower classes with this sacred mark is to raise them at once in their own estimate of their social position, and this is absolutely essential. And the Shastras prescribe ceremonies for reinvesting those people with the sacred thread who have somehow lost it. Such are the depressed classes, and to endow them with this high mark of Hinduism while not contrary to the Shastras, is essential as a symbol of purification.

Another objection is that while we do not treat these purified people as brethren we take them away from their own old associates, and thus reduce them to singular misery. This is a weighty objection, but we have to remember that the path of reform has always been difficult, and the very difficulties that stand in the way of the purified people are the ones that will herald success in the future. It is our heart's most earnest wish that the Samajic and Hindu leaders should possess the moral courage to have brotherly dealings with our purified brethren; but the laws of social evolution are unbending and reform has its obstacles and takes its time. And it is plain that in any case this reform stands today

in a very much better position than it did ten or fifteen years ago, and we are bound to move forward, if we preserve and hold fast courageously. The path of all reforms is bestrewn with thorns ; difficulties meet us at each turn, there is no reform in this world which has not its dark side. We want perseverance on the one side, and vigilance in avoiding the dark obstacles on the other. In the work of uplifting the untouchable classes, these classes themselves will have to face many difficulties and more so will be the obstacles that those who courageously seek intimate association with them will have to meet. The only solution of these difficulties lies in courageous faith and stalwart perseverance. Go forward in faith and courage, and there is not an obstacle that we shall not surmount, nor a height we shall not attain.

In the purification of those who are *keshdaris* (believe in keeping their hair long), there is no need to have any tonsure ; this would introduce unnecessary friction without any substantial advantage.

6. EDUCATION

The real basis of the uplifting of the untouchable classes is 'Education'. Education will awaken them to a realization of true facts, education will lead them to purity of thought and action, it will enable them to realise their proper rights and obligations. Education will raise their children to such level that people will welcome relationships with them, it will lead the best of them to honoured and renowned positions in the world. Education will enable them to remove from their work and occupation the many unnecessary unpleasant features which today alienate their brother Hindus from them. The most important work of the well-wishers of the depressed classes is, therefore, education. Zealous educatioanl work among these classes will convince them more than anything else of our real good wishes for them ; that alone will impress upon them the truth of our solicitude for their interests and well-being. Let us open schools for them, and let us send to these schools high class Hindu boys ; let us start works for them where they may come in easy contact with others. Walls of separation will then crumble down. In the Ambala District where caste distinctions prevail with great vigour, in the Schools of Chamars, the children of Mahajans, Brahmans, and other

castes go for their education, and the same is true in Lahore. Schools and workshops are the most efficient engines for destroying false caste pretensions. Let us all, therefore, who wish to raise these depressed classes, put our best endeavour, our utmost strength in providing the means of their education.

But for all this we want men, and we want money. We want men above all, for money will flow into a good cause if there are men to put their shoulders to work. We want workers who carry in their hearts the love of faith and who possess the courage of their convictions. Men who are fired with the zeal of religion, who are inspired by the love of serving humanity; men who cherish the sweet trust of their motherland, and who carry in their bosoms a belief in the high destiny of their race. And we want these workers of faith to have the spirit of sacrifice. No great mission can be fulfilled without faithful messengers, and the mission of uplifting our depressed brethren is the most sacred and sublime mission which any son of Bharat could seek. We want for this, messengers in whose hearts burns the sacred flame of true missionary spirit. Men who in the spirit of Dayanand would make the service of their faith, of their country, of their community, the one sacred object of their life. Young men, here is an occasion, step forth into the arena and take up this divine work in your hands. It will purify your lives; it will enrich your community and your country.

24. CONGRESS POLITICS IN 1914

FIVE OUT of the nine Provincial Congress Committees have voted in favour of my election as President of the next session of the Indian National Congress to be held at Madras in the coming Christmas. The *Leader* of Allahabad has reason to believe that the Reception Committee is likely to accept the decision of the majority of the Provincial Congress Committees though there are considerations which might induce it to act otherwise. Under the circumstances, it is time that I should make up my mind whether I am going to accept the office, if it is offered to me. The reasons on both sides may be summed up as below :

1. Why I should accept the office—

(a) Because it is the highest honour which Indians can bestow on any of their public men. It secures the person, so honoured, a definite place in the political history of the country and thereby a niche in the statuary of fame.

(b) Because it gives a splendid opportunity of making a weighty pronouncement on the political situation of the country which will be sure to receive attention not only in India but outside of India as well.

(c) Because it will enable me to enforce my ideas about the

Letter written by Lala Lajpat Rai to a friend (most probably C. Y. Chintamani of Allahabad) from England in 1914 on hearing from him that a majority of the Congress Provincial Committees had recommended that Lajpat Rai be elected President of the annual Congress Session to be held at Madras in December 1914. Lajpat Rai was reluctant to accept the office and in this letter he candidly states his attitude on the question. It so happened that the choice of Lajpat Rai was not acceptable to a number of senior Congress leaders and they arranged to have the decision reversed and elected Bhupendra Nath Basu as President of the Madras Congress. The letter is reproduced from *The People* of 14 November 1929.

conduct of business in these assemblies. I have often expressed dissatisfaction with the way in which business is conducted at present and here is an opportunity of introducing new spirit into the proceedings which must hereafter become a permanent feature thereof.

(d) Because it might induce Mr. Tilak's party to rejoin the Congress and thus unite the two wings of the Nationalist party in India.

(e) Because by declining the offer I shall be placing my friends and supporters in the different Committees who have recommended me for the office in a false position. I shall be slighting their wishes and causing bitter disappointment to them.

2. Now why I should not accept it—

(a) Because I have fundamental differences with most of the Congress leaders both on the principles on which and the manner in which the Congress is run. The Madras Congressmen are perhaps under the impression that I have changed my political opinions and have been completely reconciled to the Congress procedure which is not a fact. My political opinions remain substantially the same as they were before my deportation. I am still of opinion that the Congress should be run in the interest of the political education of the people and not for obtaining political concessions from the Government. These latter may come as an outcome of the agitation which the Congress propaganda evokes but they should not be aimed at as the immediate object of the Congress. There was a time when the Congress leaders preached boldly, placed before the people high political ideals and exhorted them to undergo sacrifices therefor. Those were the times when the Congress issued tracts of the type of *An Old Man's Hope* or *A Star in the East* and so on.[1] Those were the times when the Congress advocated the abolition of the Arms Act and insisted on the Indians' right of enrolment as volunteers. Those were the times when the leaders made speeches which may well be classed among the classics of the Congress. Those were the days when the Congress propaganda evoked enthusiasm of the highest order because the pronouncements

from the Congress platform were of the most outspoken character, stern and uncompromising in matters of principle, exhibiting an amount of fearlessness worthy of the best champions of political liberty all over the world. They at once evoked a warm response from young hearts and produced political fervour of the highest value in the country. The Congress propaganda now is affected by two considerations—fear of the Government and fear of the minorities. Both have been carried to a point which has considerably reduced the value of the Congress as a school of political education. The language of truth, of high principles, of noble politics, has now been substituted by language of diplomacy, of partial truths, and of humility and helplessness. The Congress is now dominated by practical considerations of expediency, prudence and policy towards concessions which can be won by immediate compromise. Its proceedings are conducted with an eye to measures, its success by the number of seats captured by its leaders in the Legislative Councils and by the number of places it wins from the bureaucracy for the sons of the aristocracy or the favoured among the middle classes. Most of its leaders succeeded in getting seats in the Legislative Councils, some have obtained memberships of the Executive Councils. The desire of keeping well with the authorities, and even with the most unselfish and patriotic motives has unconsciously affected their thought and much more so their speeches. The speeches delivered at the Council meetings are prepared with greater care and thoughtfulness than the speeches made at the Congress. Compare the latter with the former and the difference is palpable. The habits of compromise, and of using extremely measured language which are so useful and necessary in the Council Chamber when unconsciously introduced into the proceedings of a popular assembly like the Congress deprive it of all value as a place of political agitation. Add to it the fears of the law which have been immensely enhanced by the restrictive and suppressive measures placed on the Statute Book since 1907. How can the gentlemen who voted for the enacting of the Press Act in the Council Chamber, be expected to agitate for its repeal on the Congress platform ?[2] If the Congress has simply to re-echo what leaders do and say in he Council Chamber, then I do not see why the *Pioneer* is wrong when it says that the Congress has lost the reason of its existence.

Yet that seems to be the only use of the Congress at present. The pronouncements made from the Muslim League platform are sometimes bolder than those made at the Congress, because the former does not yet suffer from *ennui*. In my opinion the Congress should be led by people who are not connected with the Government in any capacity whatsoever, it should be presided over by men who do not aspire to seats on the Legislature or Executive Councils and the secretaries should also be men of the same category. The Congress should not be made a stepping stone to entry into the Council Chamber. I know that my opinions in this matter are not shared by the Congress leaders in Madras or for the matter of that anywhere in India and under the circumstances, I think, it will be wrong on my part to accept the office of their President.

(b) The humiliation of being a disarmed people was never brought home to me so keenly and I had never felt it so deeply as in the present war between Germany and England. Germans and Austrians on one side, the British, the French and the Belgians on the other are fighting for their liberties. Every man capable of bearing arms has a right to go to the front and inspired by loyalty [and] patriotism they are ready to die while defending their liberties and their honour with arms in their hands. It is true British statesmen have conferred the honour of fighting shoulder to shoulder with British troops on the continent upon our soldiers also but after all what are the regular soldiers if not mercenaries ? Every man in Great Britain, nay, a good number of their women also know the use of arms. A training of a month in drill, *etc*. is quite sufficient to enable them to take their place in the firing line. Thousands and hundreds of thousands have volunteered and were sent to the front within perhaps two or three or four weeks of their offer. But what about us ? Even if our offer to serve as volunteers had been accepted by the Government, we would have been more as clogs on the wheels than otherwise. Suppose the Germans were to land a force in India to-day, what would be our position ? Sir Valentine Chirol[3] has told us in so many words in the *Times* that our loyalty is actuated by a fear of "internal anarchy," others say we are afraid of the Germans and that it is born of self interest. They may be right or not, but no one can say that the observations are not justified by the state of helplessness to which we have been reduced by the operation of the Arms Act. Even

the boy scouts of Great Britain occupy a better and a more honourable position than our able bodied, grown up men, born of noble parents and engaged in noble pursuits. People may be proud of a disarmed loyalty, of a loyalty of helplessness, of a loyalty of necessity, but I am not. I feel so strongly on the point that I cannot compose a presidential address without giving a full expression to my feelings in this matter in rather strong language. I am not sure if the leading Congressmen of Madras would like it. It is not my desire to put them in a false position. I do not want to abuse their hospitality. It is very repugnant to my soul to impose on any person, much more so on people who are inviting me to a position of trust and honour. Sitting at a distance of several thousand miles from them I cannot consult them either.

(c) There is another reason why I feel I must decline the honour that is proposed to be conferred on me. Things have happened in India and outside of India in the course of the year about to close which require a strong protest and a bold handling. I have not been trained in a school of diplomacy and I do not endorse the principle that one need not be honest and truthful on all occasions particularly in politics. Yet this is not the time to use strong language or even to take a very strong attitude in the matter of our political rights which has the least prospect of being constructed into hostility to Government. If so, the only other subjects left to be discussed in the presidential address or on the platform are the ordinary platitudes about the Council Regulations, the separation of Judicial and Executive functions and so on. I am afraid the prospect does not appeal to me and I feel that by accepting the Presidentship of the Congress I will be putting myself in a wrong hole.

Of the reasons for accepting the office detailed by me in the earlier portion of the letter the most weighty are the last two. I do not, however, know what Mr. Tilak's position is and whether his party is at all prepared to join the Congress under the existing constitution.[4] As to the last no doubt it pains me considerably to disappoint my friends but I am sure they will appreciate my reasons for declining the honour. They will be the first to despise me if I were to do anything which my sense of right and wrong, of proper and improper forbids my doing. It

is the first duty of every man to be true to himself and to do nothing which might place him in a false position. They should have the satisfaction of knowing that my country and my people are always the foremost in my thoughts and that I am perhaps more useful as a private in the ranks than as a leader. Without boasting I may be allowed to say that honours and offices have never appealed to me. More than once in my life they were within my grasp but I let them go without the least pang. I will be proud to die as a common soldier serving my country to the best of my capacity in my own humble way, without honours and without offices. I hope my friends will not misunderstand me. For others I do not care.

25. AN APPEAL TO MY COUNTRYMEN

MAY I ASK for the use of your columns to make an appeal to my countrymen in the Punjab for closing their ranks and sinking their denominational differences and jealousies for the common good of their motherland. We are living in very critical times. The world is ablaze with international jealousies and quarrels and humanity is at war with each other threatening the destruction of their civilization by the weapons forged by that civilization itself. The future is very uncertain. The allies hope for victory and the Indian population is praying for victory for the British arms. But even that victory is fraught with momentous consequences for the future of the world. In what way the political relations of the different nations of the world would be readjusted ; how the map of Europe, Asia and Africa would be altered, no one can foresee or foretell. One thing, however, is certain, that there would be acute economic distress after the war, throughout the world. Whoever wins, the war must end in colossal economic losses to the nations involved, and we may be sure that huge and gigantic efforts will be put forth by all the nations of Europe to make up their losses. The Government of India, being pledged to a policy of free-trade, there is likely to be a fierce competition for the Indian markets. Japan is already putting forth herculean efforts to win Asiatic markets and to retain them after the war. That this coming economic struggle will vitally affect us may be taken for granted. We in the Punjab have already suffered immensely by the financial crisis of 1913 and 1914[1] ; and the war has in no way improved the situation, if not made it even worse. The province has been thrown at least ten years back in industrial and and commercial development ; and today we are in a worse position

Letter to the Editor, *The Tribune*, published in the issue of 20 October 1915. Lajpat Rai was in Tokyo at the time of writing. The letter is dated 7 August 1915.

than we ever were within the last twenty years, to withstand the coming onslaught on our markets and on our purses. The question of questions for us is, how to be ready for it, how to husband our resources and how to co-operate to the best advantage, to defend ourselves against the threatened exploitation. I am one of those who do not pin their faith in materialism or in commercialism, pure and simple. I have always believed and even now believe that the salvation of India will not come from commercialism and that even our economic and industrial regeneration depends a great deal upon the spiritual character of our patriotism and upon that higher morality which is above commercialism. We in the Punjab made a very fine start in the way of economic and commerical regeneration and had our industrial and commercial efforts been invariably guided by patriotism based on a sense of duty towards others and on higher morality, we should not have suffered as we have. Carried away by prospects of great immediate gains our captains and pioneers lost their balance, plunged into scheme after scheme without creating those forces of intelligence and character which were necessary for their successful management, tried to do too much at a time, enlisted forces which had no sense of proportion nor of duty nor of that higher morality, without which no great scheme can ever succeed; and the result was a great fall, a collapse which has brought untold misery in its train and what is worse which has destroyed that confidence and trust in each other, which is so absolutely necessary for the success of large industrial concerns in these days of huge combinations and trusts. Then came the war, scarcity and epidemic and on the top lawlessness. Are these, then, the times for religious controversies, or for denominational jealousies or sectarian disputes or personal bickerings? Barring *bona fide* religious controversies conducted in a spirit of search after the truth, barring such denominational rivalries as advance the cause of education, of charity and of philanthropy, denominational wars, jealousies and quarrels are desirable at no time, but in any case to engage in them at a time of national crisis and in the presence of such formidable array of circumstances creating distress, as we are facing, is criminal in the highest degree. Lost time and opportunities never come back, though, under circumstances, the losses caused might be made up. But losing time and opportunities, at a crisis like the recent, is to add hopelessness to a cause already damaged.

Communal and denominational virility is very desirable and in a community stationary and stagnant even denominational wars may, at times, be preferred to death and dissolution by inactivity ; but surely the Punjab is past that stage and should possess sufficient patriotism, intelligence and wisdom to utilise the newly created virility for better purposes and for the common good of the province. It is impossible to divide the economic life of a nation into denominational compartments. No nation can do it and it is stupid to try it. The economic forces at work are so intertwined and act and react so forcibly that any attempt to do it is not only futile but foolish. Whatever may be said about political privileges there can be no denying the fact that the economic life of the nation is one and indivisible. Thanks to circumstances, indications are not wanting of a growing consciousness on the part of the Hindu and Mohamedan advocates of separate political conditions of the two communities based on religious distinctions, that the doctrine was pernicious and harmful. Thus there is the most favourable opportunity for setting aside denominational quarrels and disputes for concerted action in the common interests of the nation. If the Hindu, Mohamedan and Sikh soldier can fight for the Empire shoulder to shoulder in the field of battle why can't the Hindus and Mohamedans and Sikhs at home combine to fight out poverty and ignorance—the common enemies of the whole nation ? While the former phenomenon redounded to the glory of the British officer, the latter is a serious reflection on the capacity, patriotism and wisdom of the leaders at home.

Disunion is the standing sin of India. Now that Hindus and Mohamedans are drawing together, the Sikhs and the Aryas have started quarrelling. I cannot tell you how painful it was to read the proceedings in the Patiala case[2]. The parties have indulged in abusing men who are entitled to the respect of the whole nation. Where on earth can one find such noble heroes as the Sikh Gurus were and what country there is in which civilised and educated people would shower abuse on the devoted head of a great man like Swami Dayanand ? If I had been in India, during the pendency of that case, I might have appealed to Messrs. Raunaq Ram and Bishamber Dass to voluntarily withdraw their book or at least not to appeal against the judgment of the first court punishing them. I do not know how the case has ended or how it is going to end. But in any case I beg most humbly and most earnestly to appeal to the Arya

leaders and the Khalsa leaders to drop all religious controversies for sometime to come....... At any rate one lesson may be drawn from these incidents, *viz.*, that none of us are immasculate and the best thing would be to take concerted action to remove the causes and to prevent their recurrence.

Lawlessness in the Punjab is not an isolated fact. It is more or less a recurring feature of Punjab life and the causes are both political and economic. In the North-Western and South-Western districts the offenders are Mohamedans because the population there is overwhelmingly Mohamedan ; the victims are the Hindus because they are the only people who can be bled without much risk. There are well to do and rich Mohamedans also but they are invariably in possession of fire-arms and have a large following of their own. The Hindus are rich, armless and few. So naturally they become the victims of lawlessness. I do not mean to say that religious fanaticism is entirely absent, but it does not play as important a part as some people fancy. The Hindu money lender is generally the target of every outbreak of lawlessness because he has so many enemies and because he is the only person whom it is convenient to victimise. Similarly in the central districts of the Punjab, the offenders are mostly Sikhs and they make no distinction between Hindus and Sikhs. The root causes in all cases, except in a few cases where the offenders are revolutionaries, are poverty and ignorance. A weakling hugs his misfortunes and bears his poverty quietly. A virile person ends by taking the law into his hands. The detection of crime may to a certain extent be affected by the Hindu-Mohamedan question, but the actual outbreak has very little, if at all, to do with it. How will the Hindus improve their position in the South-Western and North-Western districts if a few more Mohamedans are sent to jail ? The question to be solved is how to prevent the occurrence of the crime and how to improve the position of those Hindus living in the midst of a "hostile" Mohamedan population. If the situation is remediable, then the best thing for the Hindus is to remove or continue to live where they are, at the risk of being similarly treated in the future whenever the pinch of distress drives the virile Mohamedans to lawlessness. Or the other remedy is that the Hindus should live as their co-religionists live in Kabul and in the extreme frontier. To cry out like children every time there is trouble is disgraceful and only makes them the laughing stock of the world.

The best thing is to attack the root causes and to persuade the Government to grant licences to carry arms to rich Hindus living in Mohamedan villages. The best defence against lawlessness is to be always ready to meet it whenever it breaks out. Let the Hindu money lenders in the Western and North-Western districts spend a fraction of what they eventually lose by these outbreaks of lawlessness in making powerful friends among the Mohamedans, and they will find that every time there is an outbreak of lawlessness, there will be some people in the village to take their side. The love of money is the cause of their friendlessness ; and no one can honestly sympathise with them if they care more for money than their lives and honour. The efforts put forth by the Hindu leaders to secure arms of defence for the members of their community in Mohamedan villages have been rather poor. It behoves them to put forth more energetic efforts in that direction. But what is needed is concerted action for the following purposes :

(a) For the development of industries that will give employment to people who are dissatisfied with their earnings from agriculture and who cannot stand even one season of distress.

(b) The spread of education among the virile population of the province. At present agricultural population of the province is the most backward in education. Naturally they are the most credulous people and readily accept any story, however, probable or improbable that may be, circulated among them. Education will create among them a new interest in life and remove many of their wild ideas. It would also serve as a damper to fanaticism.

(c) Such relaxation of the Arms Act at least in the North-Western and South-Western districts as might enable the wealthy Hindus to keep arms.

(d) The Arya Samaj and Sikh leaders of the Tat Khalsa[3] party would do well to seriously consider the folly of continuing their quarrels and of finding some way to promote a better understanding between their respective communities. Paper resolutions and mechanical unions will be of no use. Let them approach the matter in a true national spirit and find out a remedy worthy of their traditions. Irresponsible units whom it pays to foment differences should be made to realise the dangerous nature of the game they are playing.

It would be impossible to press sufficiently forcibly upon the

attention of the Imperial authorities the necessity and desirability of giving some rights of admittance into the Overseas Dominions of Great Britain and to redress the grievances from which the Sikhs settled in Canada suffer[4], if the leaders of the different denominations in India waste away their energies in mutual wrangles. This is time when the interests of the nation require a united front and a sinking of all differences *inter-se*. Let us take a lesson from the nations that are carrying on this Great War. How they have sunk all internal differences and are facing the situation in complete harmony and unity! Shall we be never wise? Shall we never learn the true meaning of patriotism and shall we ever continue to disgrace, disfigure and injure our common mother by our disunion, by our petty quarrels and wranglings? This is the time, my beloved countrymen, to put our house in order, to prepare ourselves to face the great campaign of economic exploitation that is sure to be launched after the war, to conserve all our resources and give the best in us and of us to the solution of the problem before us. Perhaps it may be now or never.

26. REFLECTIONS ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN INDIA

THERE ARE times when silence is as criminal as indiscreet speaking at other times. In my judgement the time has come when the whole truth about the Indian situation should be told to the British public. That is my justification for saying what follows.

II.

The last ten years have furnished ample evidences of the fact that India is, as compared with the decade preceding it, seething with discontent, which not infrequently manifests itself in forms of sedition and violence. That there is unrest, even the British admit. That there is sedition also they do not and cannot deny. But they explain away the former and ascribe it to causes other than a general widespread dissatisfaction with the British rule. The latter, they maintain, is due to the mischievous propaganda of a few revolutionary malcontents, whose numbers and importance they belittle. But the many repressive and coercive measures, to which they have resorted within the last ten years in order to put down sedition, tell a different tale. The mere existence of statutory provisions for repression and coercion may not mean much, though their enactment in times of admitted unrest, and following the various violent manifestations of sedition, has its own significance. But what is conclusive evidence of the widesperad presence of seditionary distontent is the fact that the government should have had to enforce those provisions in many cases.

Originally published as a pamphlet in Japan (1915) with a short biographical note on Lala Lajpat Rai. The pamphlet was reissued in 1917 from the European Centre of the Indian Nationalist Committee, Leipzig, in English as well as in German language for propaganda purposes. The Committee did not seek permission from Lajpat Rai for issuing these reprints.

The mere enacting of a Press Act,[1] almost unsurpassed in its comprehensive rigidity and in the summary powers which it gives to the Executive Government, to supress any newspaper or publication which the Government may dislike, has not proved effective. The drastic powers given to Government by the legislature have been exercised in hundreds of cases. Hundreds of native newspapers conducted by Hindus. Mohamadans and Sikhs have been summarily dealt with under the Act, resulting in numerous cases, in the discontinuance of the publication concerned and in others, in huge monetary losses to the conductors thereof. Similarly hundreds of other publications have been proscribed and confiscated. Twice within the last eight years the Government was forced to make use of the powers granted to it by a Regulation of the late East India Company to deport Indians of position and education, without trial.[2] The law of sedition and conspiracy has been changed and altered about half a dozen times within the last eight years with a view to its being made comprehensive, deterrent, and effective. Every time the plea has been, that it was being brought into conformity with the English Law on the subject, though it was reluctantly and apologetically admitted that it was also needed to put down sedition that had made its appearance in the country. Even the law as to trials and procedure at trials, has been changed to allow the Government to select its own judges for the trial of political cases, to permit the latter to admit evidence not ordinarily admissible and to deny right of appeal to persons convicted. During the War, of course, even more stringent measures have been taken on the plea that they were necessary for the defence of the realm. Numerous Indians have been interned, numerous arrests have been made. Every letter going to or out of India is opened and numbers of them have been withheld. If a return were called for, showing the number of arrests made for or under suspicion of political crime as well as of the persons and houses and places searched for arms and in connection with political crime, within the last eight years, the figures would make startling disclosures and so also the number of alleged political offenders absconding from justice and the period during which they remained absconding.

Violent political crime made its first appearance in 1908 if we omit the disturbances in the Punjab in 1907. The unrest in the Punjab in 1907 and the disturbances resulting therefrom, were said

to be due to agrarian troubles. These agrarian troubles, however, could be traced to deep rooted economic and political causes. However, if we take 1908 as the starting point of violent political crime in India, we might say that in spite of repressive measures and in spite of Lord Morley's Reform Scheme, sedition and political crime in India has not only decreased but has actually increased since then.* It has spread over a large area, has penetrated into the non-educated classes, and has taken bolder and more audacious forms. Violence has been met by violence. Repression, suppression and confiscation by secret conspiracy and secret treason. The press has been muzzled ; yet secret propaganda goes on. The Criminal Intelligence and Criminal Investigation departments have been strengthened and have been abnormally alive and active ; private and public espionage is rampant ; platform oratary has disappeared ; open political propaganda has almost stopped. On the other hand open manifestations of loyalty have increased at least 100 fold, perhaps 1000 fold. All this can be put down to the credit of the Government, yet the balance will still be in favour of the seditionists and revolutionists. Lord Hardinge's wise statesmanship has been of the greatest value to the British, but even that has failed to restore peace and establish confidence between the rulers and the ruled. Lord Hardinge's methods have perhaps checked the growth of sedition and its violent manifestations to a certain extent but it cannot be said that sedition in India is dead or dying. At no time within the last seven years has the country been free from sedition. There have been periods of more or less lull but every such interval has been followed by an outbreak of a severer nature than the one preceding it.[3]

The War opened with a remarkable and enthusiastic outburst of loyalty. Some people thought at the time that the outburst was neither spontaneous nor genuine but even if it was, no one can deny that it has since cooled down considerably and indications are not wanting that the pendulum is perhaps going the other way.

*The Special Commissioners who tried the Lahore Conspiracy Case say in their final judgement. "We know that in 1907 a wave of sedition passed over India, including the Punjab. We know, too, that the wave of sedition has kept ebbing and flowing since then."

In the War the British had a splendid and God-sent opportunity of irrevocably binding India to them and of uprooting sedition, but they have by their policy of mistrust and jingoism, lost it for ever. The policy of trust and goodwill might have killed sedition and created a strong reaction against the revolutionaries and the violent politicals but the policy actually pursued and the cruel and savage sentences given in political cause have reversed the feeling. People are asking "If this is happening during the war, what can we hope for, after the war is over." The War is now more than one year old. Comparing the first six months with the last six months one can judge of the change that has taken place in the feeling both in India and England. The officials and the loyalists have their own explanations of the conspiracies that have come to light and of the disturbances that have taken place. We shall examine these explanations later on but the facts (a) that thousands of native Indians have been interned (b) that thousands of arrests have been made in the Punjab, and Bengal, and numbers in other provinces (c) that Special Tribunals had to be created for the trial of these cases and (d) last but not the least that this time at least units of the army were actually tampered with and had to be executed, show that (a) unrest in India is not now confined to the intellectuals. (b) that it is not confined to a few (c) that the causes of dissatisfaction are deep seated and fundamental. This is particularly shown by the wholesale loot that went on for a number of days in the South Western districts of the Punjab.[4] For a man not biased by pre-disposition or political motives and possessed of a sober temper and a clear mind, the evidence in the conspiracy and dacoity cases tried at Lahore and Multan by the special Tribunals created, under the Defence of India Act, by the Executive Government of the Punjab, is full of significance. Standing by themselves perhaps those conspiracies may not be sufficient for a verdict that there is deep seated widespread discontent in the Punjab, but read in the light of past events, of what has been happening in the North-West districts of Punjab for the last ten years, of what happened in 1907, 1910, 1913 and 1914 and comparing all this with the loyalty of the Punjab in the seventies and eighties, one who knows the province well, cannot but conclude that the Punjab, the recruiting ground of the British Indian army,

is seething with discontent.* And what is true of the Punjab, is more or less true of the rest of India. The Punjabees are a virile people, less versed in the art and ways of diplomacy and they cannot for long be patient nor can perhaps the Bengalees who are a sentimental people. The causes of discontent, however, that are at the bottom of the political condition of these provinces are more or less of general application.

Yet the most important fact in connection with the Government of India is that neither the ruling bureaucracy nor the moderate Indian nationalists admit that discontent is widespread. The extremists among the Anglo-Indians and the extremists among the Indians sometimes admit the existence of this widespread discontent but their voices are drowned in the chorus of denials and repudiations made by the authorities, and the moderates among the nationalists. The extremists of the Anglo-Indian press want more repression and more brute force in the administration of the country; they deprecate conciliation. They have always opposed the extension of representative institutions and the employment of native agency in the higher ranks of officialdom. They are opposed to Council Government and they oppose any further extension of Legislative Councils. They do not want any Indians in the higher offices; much less a large number of them. They think that the British forms of justice are unsuited to the country and that the country suffers from over-education. They hold that India was conquered by sword and ought to be held by the sword. In short they are for an absolute, unmitigated despotism. They admit the existence of a widespread discontent, ascribe it to education and lenient administration and want the Government to pursue a policy of repression and extirpation without regard to the principles of law or procedure or the feelings of the people. All talk of leniency and equality is "damned nonsense" in their eyes. Some of them are brutally frank and say that as India belongs to them by

*The Special Commissioners who tried the Lahore Conspiracy Case, admit that the Conspiracy was "widespread" and that they are not sure if all its ramifications have been discovered but they are satisfied that the bulk of people are loyal. The Lieutenant-Governor says that if not promptly checked "It would have produced in the Province a state of affairs similar to that of Hindustan in the Mutiny of 1857." !

virtue of conquest they are entitled to make the most out of it. The rank and file of the official bureaucracy in India think on the same lines, but the highest among them do not, nor do the Government at home. They would not admit the existence of a widespread and deep seated disaffection in India because that would be a serious reflection on their rule. They do not want the British democracy or the world to know, that their rule in India has been a failure and that the people regard it as tyrannical and oppressive. Thus they belittle these manifestations of sedition, and trace them to the doings and sayings of a set of mischievous revolutionaries, with whom the people at large have no sympathy. They justify their repressive measures directed against the revolutionaries, and they try to conciliate the rest of the country by homeopathic doses of political concessions, and label them as the "expansion of the liberties of the people of India." The moderates amongst the Indian nationalists admit that the people are discontented but they deny that their discontent is so deep and widespread as to amount to disloyalty. They oppose repressive legislation but when the Government confronts them with the details of political crimes and contends that the repressive legislation is directed against the "revolutionaries" only, and as law abiding constitutional reformers it was their duty to help the Government in maintaining law and uprooting crime, they are not only silenced but forced to vote with the Government. We thus find a Gokhale supporting a Press Act and a Surendra Nath Bannerji voting for a crimes act and other coercive measures. The fact is that inconsistency reigns supreme in all political circles in India and the situation is so perplexing and peculiar that no one can afford to be absolutely frank and speak the whole truth. Consistency in politics, once said Lord Roseberry, could only be maintained by an ass and as the politicians of India (Anglo-Indians and Indians) are not asses, they don't care for consisteney.

The situation in India is, however, becoming grave and the fate of both England and India is involved. If England loses India, she loses her rank as a world power but what is even more important is, that she loses the greatest market she has for her goods. On the other hand, Indians are not quite sure that their troubles will end by the severence of their connection with England. The most thoughtful amongst them are inclined to think

that perhaps the real troubles will only commence when the British have left India. The British loss of India can be accounted for in two ways ; either by another great power taking India or by India becoming independent. So far as the first is concerned a few years before, no Indian entertained the idea of exchanging masters. In his opinion no calamity could be greater and more disastrous than that. The people of India, high and low, loyalists and nationalists were all agreed on that point. But now I am afraid there is no such unanimity even on that question. The Indians travelling abroad have seen American rule in the Phillipines and the Hawaii islands and the French rule in Indo-China, and through their writings, the Indians at home have also come to know something about the rule of other nations over their possessions and the superiority which in their eyes British rule in this respect possessed as compared with other foreign administrations in the world, has at least dwindled if not disappeared. In some respects the British rule in India is worse than the Russian rule in Turkistan, and much worse than even Czar's in Russia. On the other point also there is no unanimity. Some of the extremists are inclined to think that no liberty is worth having which is not won by force ; that every nation has to pass through a test of blood, before it can establish a free national government and that a period of anarchy and disorder and bloodshed must precede the establishment of a firm government of the people, for the people, based on law. For them the prospect of years of anarchy, disorder and bloodshed, has no terror. There are others, however, who cannot look at the thing in that way; they abhor disorder and bloodshed and would rather remain under an alien government than face anarchy.

Then there is the Hindu-Mohamadan problem. There are some among the Hindu Nationalists who would prefer a Moslem Government over the British Government but their number is not very large. The bulk of the Hindus would not like Moslem supremacy and *vice versa*. But there are enough indications that the Hindus and Mohamadans are being animated by common patriotism and the feeling is getting stronger and stronger every day that it should not be impossible to evolve a system of national government which may be acceptable to Hindus and Moslems alike and that in politics, the religious

distinctions should be altogether dropped. The feeling, however, requires time for consolidation and strengthening and this consideration weighs heavily with the Hindu and Mohamadan Nationalists, who though they will love to have India free, do not desire the immediate severance of British connection with India. To this class belong a large number of thoughtful moderates and in the same category are to be found a good many of thoughtful extremists. In any case it shall not be far from the truth to say that their loyalty to England is not actuated by a love of the British Government but by the fears of the immediate future of their country, in case the British have to leave it ; yet neither their fears nor their hopes can stop the spread of revolutionary ideas and the expansion and development of the movement for independence. Every death sentence passed by the British Courts of justice on those who are caught in the revolutionary campaign sends the roots of the movement deeper and deeper and strengthens its foundations.* The sufferings of political convicts and political prisoners are acting as powerful incentives for future action and there seems to be no chance of the movement dying out for want of fresh recruits or for fear.

The truth is that all classes of Indians are thoroughly discontented, with the exception, of course, of those, who are in receipt of large profits by their connection with the British Government. As compared with the total strength of the nation the number of the latter must necessarily be small, and although they exert a certain amount of influence on society and have some following, their influence counts for little so far as the strata of society is concerned from which the revolutionaries get their recruits. A powerful government with untold resources of wealth and with a large army at its back can always command the allegiance and services of a large number of people who will spy on the movements of their own countrymen and who will hand them over to justice, as soon as they can do so with sure prospects of gain and profit. Once in the hands of the authorities

*In the Punjab alone within the last eight months from February to September between 50 to 60 youngmen have received death sentences, and a larger number have been transported for life or imprisoned for long periods.

their conviction and punishment follows of course. Every such conviction, however, adds to the strength of the movement. The convicts become "martyrs" and those who are acquitted begin to actively sympathise with the movement even if they were absolutely indifferent before. Some of them may drift downward and may retire to private life. But there are a good many who become dour and begin to harbour thoughts of revenge. The sufferings and tortures that they have undergone during trial wipe out the last traces of loyalty, if any, that existed in their thoughts. In any case, their loyalty disappears for good and they become active and passive opponents of the British rule in India. Thus the number of the enemies of the British Raj in India. is ever on the increase and that of its friends and admirers on the decrease. Those who have once gone through the fire whether convicted or acquitted provide nourishment as well as strength for the growth of the tree which is thus constantly renovated and kept standing. Say what interested politicians (Indians or Anglo-Indians) may, there are no signs that the revolutionary movement in India is in any danger of extinction or extirpation or of being appreciably weakened. The reactionaries among the Anglo-Indians and British politicians in India as well as in England, whose number is fairly large and who always keep themselves before the public eyes, are the most important allies of the revolutionaries, and so are such moderates and loyalists who speak of the revolutionaries with contempt and ridicule their courage, their patriotism, and their strength. It may require a certain amount of courage to call a man, from whom one differs, a coward but it furnishes a certain incentive to the latter to prove that he is not. The British vilifiers of the Bengalees and their loyalist followers have contributed in no small degree to the evolution of the "Bengalee anarchist." To call a disarmed nation, deprived of all means of offence or defence, a nation of cowards, may be an act of courage and pride on the part of those who indulge in this sort of vilification, but it leaves its sure mark on the souls of the latter and helps materially in the bringing about of gradual transformation which goads them to desperate deeds. Thus every reactionary in Indian politics and every vilifier of the Indian people is a source of indirect strength and inspiration to the revolutionaries and the latter rely upon them for furnishing materials for their propaganda.

Under the present state of law, the Indian Press can hardly carry on a campaign of constructive political ideas. They cannot even discuss abstract political theories because they may be dangerously suggestive. They cannot discuss India's past history because their discussions may be interpreted as veiled sedition. They cannot speak of the miseries and troubles of the masses and appeal to them to take steps to have their wrongs righted. No Indian journalist can use the language every day used in Europe and America by Socialists, Republicans, and Democrats against capitalists, bureaucrats, militarists and royalists without running the almost certain risk of being proceeded against under the Press Act. Comments on current topics in the light of past history may bring the writer perilously near the Andamans. The *Comrade*[5] of Delhi (a Mohamadan paper of influence) was proceeded against because it referred to the past history of Egypt—in commenting upon the conduct of Turkey in joining this War. The writer expressed his disapproval of the present action of Turkey but in his discussion referred to certain events that had happened in Egypt in the past. No one could prove that his references were inaccurate or his language incendiary, but the highest British Court, declared that it was sedition to publish such historical truths as might in any way influence the Indians to think disparagingly of the English. Similarly it is out of the question for any Indian in India to try to establish by evidence or argument that the statements made by British historians about the Mutiny of 1857 or about the conduct of the mutineers, are incorrect. Any attempt to defend the rebels or to speak in admiration of their deeds or in extenuation of the charges laid at their door by biased historians may bring the writer within the clutches of the law and afford ground for a sentence of death or transportation for life. While in India, an Indian can hardly carry on any historical research on British administration as it may easily tend to bring the Government into contempt or hatred. Books speaking of British conquest or of British administration in India if published by European or American publishers may be sold in India but their translations into vernacular become actionable. A translator of Seeley's *Expansion of England* was once prosecuted for sedition not because the translation was a perversion of the original but because it was likely to create disaffection against the British. A translator of Mr. Bryan's (the American statesman) article on

British rule in India was actually convicted of sedition and sentenced to a term of imprisonment.[6]

Under these circumstances, it is no wonder that the Indian Press only lives on the mistakes of the English or Anglo-Indian reactionaries—such mistakes as the House of Lords was lately guilty of, in throwing out the Government of India's proposal to grant an Executive Council to the United Provinces.[7] The Indian press was for months excited over the action of the House of Lords in this matter and judging from the amount of space and attention devoted to it, an outsider might have reasonably concluded that the fate of the United Provinces or India, rested on the measure. The measure itself is not of such importance but the Indian politician sees in its rejection, an end of many of his fondly cherished hopes in the direction of a speedy advance in self-government. If an innocent and harmless measure like that, supported by the Government of India and accepted by the Cabinet could not be carried through, what chance there was, argued the Indian politician, of any measure of real autonomy being conceded to India in the near future. A mistake like that comes very handy to the moderate press, but it is dangerously effective in the hands of the extremists. It brings fresh recruits to the ranks of the latter ; it feeds his movement as fuel feeds fire ; it gives him opportunity to ridicule the moderate politics and to pursue his propaganda with renewed force, irresistible logic and fatal success. Thus the movement goes on, finding fresh strength, renewed vitality and driving force day by day. As soon as the courts have disposed of one batch of seditionists, another comes forward and takes up the work of their imprisoned or dead comrades.

Outside India, the number of Indians sincerely loyal to the British connection cannot exceed five per cent. The Indians outside India belong to all communities, religions and classes and there can be no explanation of their unconcealed disloyalty towards Britain except that British rule in India does not satisfy them and they think that their national backwardness is due to that rule. The contempt with which the other parts of the British Empire and the world outside, treats them, affects them deeply and they begin to feel that life without liberty is not worth living. Indians settled or working in Canada or United States of

America are, as a rule, materially much better off outside of India, than they would have been in their own native land. Some of them are owners of landed property. Others have good banking accounts. Every one gets enough to eat and drink and live well and also save some thing for the rainy day. Yet the evidence in the Lahore Conspiracy Case[8] has disclosed how numbers of them left these cheering environments and proceeded to India, practically to give up their lives for the cause of their country's freedom. When put on their trial they made no secret of their mission and openly confessed their love of freedom and have since willingly paid the penalty for that. This is the second case after the Alipore Bomb Case of 1908 in which the accused made no attempt to conceal their hatred for foreign Government and their desire to free their country of it.

To a man who had known India of the nineteenth century, this fact is phenomenal. The numerous young men engaged in secret propaganda cannot be unaware of the almost hopelessness of immediate results. Their willingness to suffer and to die for the cause of their country, in spite of that knowledge, is symptomatic of the changed attitude of the country and is pregnant with meaning to those who have the intelligence to understand. India has entered on a new phase. Her sons (in thousands and hundreds of thousands) have begun to feel that it is worthwhile to die in the cause of freedom. With 315 millions of their countrymen behind them, they can well afford to die even in millions if thereby they can loosen the bonds of slavery which enchain their country and their countrymen. Large numbers feel that life without liberty is a mere existence but life without honour is even worse. It is a disgrace. Hardly a day passes but when the force of circumstances makes them feel that they are a despised people. Their sense of honour is outraged at every step of their life and they become sullen and discontented. It is extremely painful to see young men of great promise, high education, of lofty motives, of noble mien and some of them of the noblest families in the land throwing away their lives, for the merest chance of awakening the country to a sense of shame. It would be a slight to their intelligence to suppose that they entertain any hope of immediate success. Success is not what they aspire after. They die in order to show to their countrymen, the path to liberation. They die because in their

judgement there is no other way *now* (under the regime of Press and Seditious Meetings Acts) to preach patriotism and to exhort people to love their country. Once a country enters that phase, the task of an alien Government becomes impossible. It may linger on for a number of years but its fate is sealed. Oh ! how we wish the British administrators of India would realise that. We are afraid they do not. Else they would not act as they have in the last ten years. What the British statesman ought to realise once for all is, that it is not in the power of any human agency to set back the hours of the clock and that repression will not succeed where substantial concessions may. The Indian movement has passed that stage when it could be stifled by repression. It has entered on a new stage. Once in that stage, no nation can be kept in chains for long. You might exact a heavy toll from people who try to cross the bridge but determined men will cross it, notwithstanding. Nay, they may in the course of the crossing exact a fairly heavy toll of blood from the toll collectors as well.

The love of freedom newly awakened in India finds more than ample support from the chronic poverty from which the Indian masses suffer from day to day. The Britishers' chief boast is the protection they give to the poor against the rich. Yet the increase of crime among the poor due to poverty and ignorance is appalling. The rich often, if not always, escape punishment because they can buy their freedom but the poor have to suffer and the jails are full of them. The question of the poverty of India and its increase under the British rule has been very ably and exhaustively dealt with by the late Mr. Digby C. I. E. in his book ironically called "Prosperous British India" and by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in his book "Un-British Rule in India." We have no intention of discussing the matter here but we may just note that the British method of estimating the prosperity of the country by trade returns or by the amount of gold imported into the country or by the rise in the price of land is fallacious. The prosperity of a country must be judged by the economic position of the wage earner, and judged from that point of view it can be conclusively proved that the wage-earning classes are in effect much poorer today than they were ever before. That is the true explanation

of the increase of lawlessness all over the country, particularly in the Punjab. The rise in wages is not always proportionate to the rise in prices and judged by that standard, the wages have actually fallen. In pre-British days the agricultural labourer was paid in kind. Now he is paid in cash. This cash does not bring him as much food as he used to get when he was paid in kind. Add to this the change in standards of life and the expenses that have been made necessary by the advent of "civilization." The purchasing power of the Rupee has considerably fallen and that has affected the poor classes most. The fact that the British Government can find recruits for their army on a salary of less than five shillings a week and police constabulary on a salary of less than four shillings a week shows the economic condition of the masses.

Lawlessness in the Punjab is increasing and shall continue to increase as long as the economic position of masses continues what it is today. The opening of canals and canal colonies have saved the situation only partially. The classes that have mostly benefited from it, are the capitalists or those among the farmers who had some money resources at their back. The peasantry of the North-Western Province and of the Western and South-Western districts of the Punjab live in a state of chronic poverty. Their ignorance is colossal. They are unable to defend themselves against the tricks of professional money lenders. Add to this their religious prejudice against the Hindus. A combination of these three causes (a) abject and grinding poverty (b) ignorance (c) religious fanaticism, explains the outburst of lawlessness in these parts of the Punjab. The outbreak of the War gave only a new point to their ignorance and poverty and they fell upon the unarmed Hindu population (the only people having blood) like wolves. Their readiness to believe that the British rule was over, shows the amount of confidence they repose in the power of the British. They are a virile people physically fit and the prominent among them have arms. Moreover, they are in an overwhelming majority in those districts. They spare the rich and well-to-do Mohamadans because the latter have arms and followers. The Hindu trader and money lender has neither. It is absolute rot to talk of German intrigues or of Turkish influence in connection with

these riots and it is equally absurd to say that they were due to the abnormal rise in prices. What happened in the South-Western districts on a wholesale scale, in the course of two or three months in the early part of this year, has been taking place in instalments in the North-Western districts for the last ten years. The Government has so far ignominiously failed to check it. We are disposed to think that the violent crime in the Punjab and in the N.W. Frontier Province will not be checked by the increase of the police force. The device of imposing temporary punitive police upon an already famishing population is both stupid and cruel. The root causes are political and economic and unless they are removed, the violent crime will not disappear either in the Punjab or from Bengal and will soon make its appearance in other provinces as well. The causes are (a) ignorance (b) poverty (c) want of arms of defence (d) want of training to meet armed and desperate men (e) political despair. These root causes cannot be removed except by radical changes in the form, constitution and policy of the Government.

The Hindu leaders of the Punjab are foolish to make it a Hindu-Mohamadan question. The Hindus in the Punjab have been misled throughout by self-seeking leaders. The fact is that they have neither intelligence to probe into the real causes of these troubles nor courage enough to boldly proclaim them. They are working on wrong lines. The Hindu Sabha in the Punjab professes to be a non-political body, yet it meddles in politics always on the wrong side. As a non-political body it can only foment differences and disunion among the Hindus. It has neither resources nor courage nor even intelligence and wisdom. It is mostly a body of time servers who want to remain in the good books of the Government and to get favours by keeping the Hindus away from politics. The sooner the Hindus realise this, the better for them. Nay the sooner the Government realise this the better for them also, perhaps. The revolutionary propaganda in the Punjab owes its virility, in part at least, to the absence of "legitimate" constitutional political activity in that province. The latter has been made impossible by the repressive and harsh policy of the Punjab Government, who have in this respect been materially helped by the Hindu Sabha and the Muslim League. The political

life in the Punjab on Congress lines has been crushed by the oppressive methods of the Punjab Government, the Punjab judiciary, as well as by the denominational jealousies of the province which have been fanned, encouraged and deliberately kept alive and strengthened by Government policy. The sentences passed in political cases and the convictions obtained in the Punjab, are unique in the history of political crime in India.* They have no parallel either in Bengal, or in Bombay or even in Madras or U. P. Yet the Punjab Press** or the Punjab public bodies have not raised even a feeble voice of protest. Persons have been hanged on evidence which would not have been considered sufficient or reliable for conviction anywhere else in India. Last but not least the Punjab Government have stooped to the most contemptible of Russian methods, in employing *agents provocateurs* for the detection of political crime. Any one who reads the evidence in the Lahore Conspiracy Case can find that out, but for facility of reference I take the following from the authorised report of the proceedings of that case. "Liaqat Hussein Khan, Deputy Superintendent of Police Amritsar, is reported to have said that on [ ] February 1915 witness sent for Bela Singh Zaildar of Kohala and told him that he should secure the services of a man who could help them in getting at the returned emigrants and work as a police spy. Bela Singh brought one Kirpal Singh of Barar (informer) and said that the man had spent some time in the Straits Settlement, knew some of the returned emigrants and would be able to win the confidence of the conspirators through his cousin Balwant Singh, a *sowar*, who was a constant associate of the returned emigrants. Henceforth Kirpal Singh kept witness constantly informed of the doings and movements of the Ghadr party. Witness kept the Deputy Inspector

*The *Bengalee* of Calcutta in a most soberly written article commenting on the sentences given in the Lahore Conspiracy Case by the Special Tribunal says that "it would be difficult to find a parallel to this in our annals of justice." Similiar are the comments of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, another leading Calcutta daily.

**The sentences given in the Lahore Conspiracy Case have proved too much even for the Punjabee Press. The *Tribune* and *The Panjabee* have come out with bold protests. The *Tribune* characterises them as "shocking" and the comments of *The Panjabee* are equally outspoken and manly.

General of Criminal Intelligence Department duly informed of all that-......*At witness's suggestion Kirpal Singh had proposed and the conspirators agreed to attack the local police station for arms.*"

The following is the authorised report of the statement of the Police spy Kirpal Singh who had been deputed by Deputy Superintendent Liaqat Hussein Khan...........He "made a long statement wherein he explained how he won the confidence of the accused.........How he entered into their plans and not only took part in their discussion but suggested raids and dacoities in order to get the conspirators together and facilitate their arrest."*

Other witnesses have stated how Kirpal Singh persuaded them to join the conspiracy although they were unwilling to do so or at least reluctant.

If a list of proceedings under the Press Act were called for, it will be found that the Punjab Government's achievements are the greatest, for the simple reason that the Punjab bureaucracy has been the least affected by the changes that India has seen within the last fifty years and the administrative machinery of the Punjab is the most antiquated and reactionary. What the Punjab Government has achieved by these methods can better be judged by the abnormal increase in lawlessness, in political crime and in denominational disputes in the Punjab within the last ten years. Lip loyalty and manifestations of loyalty have multiplied, and so also have sedition and discontent. The former has driven the latter underground and made it more dangerous. The Punjab Government has done nothing to uproot the causes. On the other hand they have added to the unrest by enhancement of land tax and water rate, by their Land Alienation Acts, by their Colonization Acts and Regulations, and by their opposition to the expansion of education.**

*The proceedings of the Special Tribunal were not allowed to be reported in full. The Press was not admitted. A reporter was engaged by the Government who issued a brief statement every day purporting to give the substance of the proceedings. These extracts are from this official report.

**As an illustration of the statesmanship of the Punjab Govt. we give the following extract from a recent speech made by His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor. "The comparison has been made between the

Continued on p. 241

It cannot be denied that compared with the Government of other provinces, the Punjab administration has been more stupid and reactionary but after all it is only a question of degree. The discontent in India is based on fundamental grounds and unless they are boldly, and in a spirit of true genuine liberal statesmanship handled, there is no chance of India being pacified. The truth is, that India has outgrown the patriarchal form of government and no policy short of one of complete trust will be of much avail now. The present policy is one of fine and simple despotism, denying the people their fundamental rights. Say what the Governors and others may, the people cannot accept that the policy of the Government is determined for the good of India and that it is in their interests that the present policy should be maintained. The extremists among the Anglo-Indian politicians and the *London Times* also feel that, and at times make frank admissions which confirm the people in their ideas about their Government. The fact is that India is governed by a handful of white people in the interests of the latter and that this is only possible by denying the people their fundamental rights.

The whole world is free to keep arms and use arms. Every civilized nation is interested in giving a military training to her boys and citizens and in teaching them the use of arms and other military tactics. Some countries do this by conscription, others do it on a voluntary basis. No government entitled to be called sane ever thinks of denying arms to such of its people as want to use them for legitimate purposes. The free possession of arms and free training in military tactics for purposes of individual and national defence is the birth right of every son of a mother. Even the Amir of Kabul does not deny that to his

Revolutionary leaders in the Punjab and the Boer rebels such as DeWet. I have no sympathy with DeWet. He was a rebel and a traitor. One should be just even to a traitor and it should be unjust to place him in the same category as the men whose aims and actions I have described to you. DeWet and his adherents took the field openly as rebels, they carried their lives in their hands and many of them paid the forfeit. Revolution was their end, but wholesale murder, robbery and terrorism were not among their methods nor was the bomb among their weapons."

people. Nations are vying with each other in their military preparations and in giving military training to their citizens. Even China is thinking of introducing conscription. In Japan military training is compulsory. In some places even the girls learn the use of arms and practise fencing. In the United States as well as in the other states of America the Negroes and the American Indians can keep arms and receive military training. But the Indians of India cannot keep arms. Every nation is interested in the manufacture of arms and ammunition and in inventing effective methods of dealing with their enemies. Governments give every encouragement to those who invent new arms or improve old ones. All this is denied to the Indians.* Why? Because they are a subject people. Their Government cannot trust them.

The strength of the native army in India cannot exceed a certain proportion of the British army; they cannot handle the artillery; and numerous other restrictions are imposed upon the possession and use of arms by them. Why? Are they not fit to handle arms? Are they not brave? Are they intemperate? No Indian can get a commissioned rank, however high by birth or social position, however fit by education. No Indian can be admitted into a Military College in India, or in Great Britain. Why? Are they unfit, or intellectually and physically imbeciles? The truth is that the Government of India not being their own government, they cannot be trusted. They can be enrolled as mere soldiers and that only in certain numbers. Beyond that they cannot get any military training or military rank. Nor can the civil population be trusted to keep arms, much less to manufacture them. Much fuss has been made over the Indians having

*The ludicrous extent to which the prohibition to keep and use arms has been carried will be better illustrated by the following incident reported by the *Bengalee* of Calcutta.

"A five year old boy of Munshiganj Road, Kidderpore, had a toy pistol purchased for one anna. On the 8th August last the child was playing with it but could not explode the paper caps. A thirteen years old lad showed him how to do it. The boy was at once arrested by a beat constable and marched off to the Watganj thana with the firearm. The boy was eventually sent up for trial at Alipur and the Court fined him three rupees."

been allowed to participate in the European War. The Indians have gone mad over the incident as if that was the greatest boon that could be conferred on them. The truth is that the step was actuated by and taken purely in British interests. Without the Indian contingent, Great Britain could not send a decent expeditionary force to France. The whole of the white army could not be removed from India. In removing large numbers of them, it was necessary to remove proportionately large numbers of the native army also. The British Government is always distrustful of the native army. No amount of false statements and fallacious reasoning can conceal the fact that the British in India cannot allow the Indians to manufacture arms or carry arms, cannot give them a military training, cannot even keep a large native army (more than double the strength of the permanent British garrison) because, being foreigners they cannot trust them. They fear that some day the arms or military training given them may be used against themselves. Looking at it from their point of view it cannot be said that they are not right. But then, why ask the Indians to accept that the Government is national and that they are the equal subjects of the Crown ; why hide the truth and make false and hypocritical declarations to the contrary ? The British know the weakness of their rule in India and in the disarming of the people they see the best guarantee of the continuance of their rule and power. In the matter of arms, the present situation in India is this. One may steal arms, one may smuggle them ; one may illicitly purchase them from those who have the freedom of possessing, for the purpose of committing crime but one cannot have them for defending his life and property, the life and honour of his family (his wife, his mother, his sisters, and his daughters). It is this which gives awful power to the lawless portions of the society and which explains the losses and hardships of those who have suffered from the depredations of the latter and are suffering from dacoities and robberies and murders in Bengal and the Punjab and elsewhere. There are plenty of arms in the country for the criminal but none for the peace loving (who only want them for defensive purposes). All this because the Government of India is a foreign government who cannot trust their subjects and who do not believe in their loyalty.

In the light of this fact all talk about the extraordinary outburst of loyalty becomes stale. So long as this state of things continues it is useless for the Government to expect that the people can accept it, and treat it, as if it were their own national government. Never before since the introduction of British rule in India was the sense of helplessness that arises of the consciousness of being a disarmed people, brought home to the people of India so vividly and strongly as during the War. A new fear has dawned on the public mind. "Suppose the British lose, we are lost" says the Indian. The Germans may come or the Russians or even the Amir, we cannot even make a show of a resistance. All the wisdom and legal arguments of Chandavarkars or Sinhas will not avail us. A people so helpless and dependent deserve to be despised by the world. The War has made the Indian feel that as a British subject he is really a despicable creature entitled to no consideration at the hands of the other people of the world. Even the negroes (whether in Africa or America) are much better placed than he is. The prayers of Indian C. I. E.s and Rai Bahadurs and Khan Bahadurs notwithstanding, the British cannot be invincible for ever. The time is to come when their prowess in arms will decay. What will then be the fate of India and Indians? Will they be transferred like sheep? If not actually transferred by agreement, the nation replacing the English in the world power will take possession of India The very idea is disquieting and crushingly humiliating. But this is not the only circumstance which constantly reminds people that their government is an alien government whose interest in them is only secondary.

Let us look at education in India. India has been under British rule now for a century and a half in some parts, for over a century in others and for at least sixty-five years in the Punjab. Yet the percentage of illiteracy is well nigh ninety-five per cent. taking the progress of the whole of India. Greatest ignorance prevails among the peasantry and the military classes, the two great bulwarks of British rule in India. What has the Government done to educate these classes. Nothing. Some maintain that they have been deliberately kept out of education because once educated they may no longer be such willing tools as they are now.

Agriculture in India as elsewhere is the least paying of industries and it is not at all strange that large number of sturdy Punjabees perfer to labour in other countries rather than rot on their farms in the Punjab. In the early years of British rule the educated and the trading classes flourished and became prosperous, but now they are thoroughly discontented. The native traders are no longer happy under British rule (1) because the network of railways and foreign import and export offices dealing direct with the producer and the consumer have ruined their business (2) because the facilities available to them in the early days of British rule have disappeared (3) because the bureaucracy is always inciting the agricultural and military classes against them and heaping insults on their devoted heads both by word and deed. In almost every province, special legislation has been enacted professedly in the interests of the agricultural classes but really directed against the Indian trader or money lender. Instead, what has the Government done to open non-agricultural pursuits to them. Nothing. In the whole length and breadth of the country there is not a single Technological Institute. The private or aided Technological Institutes are called by that name only by courtesy. In these days of international trade there is no provision in any of the Indian Universities for the teaching of modern languages. While Germans, Austrians, Italians, Americans and Japanese can learn Hindustanee and English in their own countries in order to further their trade with India, the Government of India have never given a thought to the necessity of making a provision for the teaching of German, French, Japanese *etc.* to the Indians and of encouraging Indians to learn these languages. The best part of a boy student's life is compulsorily spent in acquiring excellence in the use of the English language. Indians are not supposed to know other languages or to trade with other countries because the English do it for them. It is not the concern of the British to encourage the natives to have direct commercial transactions with foreign countries. There is not a single place in India where an Indian student can do real research work in chemistry or other sciences. While the country is full of mines there is no place to learn mining. Hundreds of steamers come and go from Indian ports but there is no place in India where an Indian youth can qualify

himself even for the merchant marine, not to speak of the navy. In the whole of India with its splendid resources there is not a single place where ships can be built. The Indian Government has never given a thought to these questions because they do not concern them ; because they are not interested in the development of the indigenous industries and in raising the status of the people. They have done a lot to encourage the produce of raw materials necessary for their industries or for their food (cotton, wheat, oil seeds *etc.*) but almost nothing to encourage manufacturing industries. Originally they wanted to preserve the Indian markets for themselves only but their policy of free trade stood in the way and latterly the Germans and now the Japanese are sharing that market with them, but to teach the Indian to manufacture for his own consumption has never entered the thought of those responsible for the administration of India. Perhaps it is not right to say that it never entered their thought. They are too intelligent and shrewd not to know that they had not done their duty to India in these matters but the interest of their own people was paramount and that they could not set aside.

The British Government in India cannot go in for universal elementary education as there is a danger of even greater disaffection resulting therefrom ; they cannot give technical education of a high order as that might interfere with British industries ; they cannot protect Indian industries for the same reason ; they cannot provide for real high class commercial education with a teaching of foreign languages and a knowledge of seafaring and navigation as they do not want the Indians to directly engage in overseas trade and contract relations with other nations. They cannot protect and subsidise Indian industries as that is opposed to free trade and detrimental to British industries. Yet they want the Indians to believe that the British Government in India is primarily conducted in the interests of India.

The people of India must remain ignorant, illiterate and industrially and commercially dependent because that benefits England and is for the advantage of her people.

But that is not all. The Government of India cannot even provide for high class education in sciences, in engineering and

in medicine for the simple reason that the higher branches of these professions they want to reserve for their own people. Of late the number of Indians educated and trained in these departments of knowledge in British and other foreign Universities has so increased as to become rather embarrassing to the Government of India. They cannot utilise them without reducing the number of Britishers in these services. This they do not desire. The result is that there are numbers of qualified Indians in India with high class British and European qualifications who have to be contented with subordinate positions under Britishers of lesser qualifications, and perhaps at times, of no qualifications. The competitive examinations for higher services are held in England which in itself is a great injustice but this year on account of the war, there being fewer qualified Britishers to compete for these services, the Government has resolved to discontinue some of the examinations, for fear lest a larger number of Indians than is desirable, might get into them. Can they still say that the Government of India is as good or perhaps better than a national Government? The truth is that they do not want a larger number of Indians in the higher services because they cannot trust them. For the same reason they distrust private educational institutions and insist upon the employment of Britishers as Inspectors of Schools and as professors in the educational service. They will allow a certain number of Indians in the higher offices but that number must not be so large as to make it even remotely possible for them to create trouble for the Government.

The same fear underlies the administration of local bodies and the constitution and powers of the Councils. It is simply begging the question to argue that Indians are not yet ready or fit for representative institutions. The real question is the dread of power passing from the Britishers into Indian hands.* It is that dread that is the dominating influence in the policy of the British Government in India. India is a possession and dependency and must be administered in the best interests of the

*Mr. Lowes Dickinson, an English Professor, who has largely travelled in India has practically admitted the truth of this remark. (P. 23, *An Essay on the Civilization of India, China, and Japan.* see also Pp. 27 and 28.

master. Many credulous Indians talk of the liberty loving traditions of the British democracy but they forget that the application of these traditions to India would make such big holes in their safes, purses and incomes that they as men swayed by self-interest and love of power and glory, can never think of enforcing these principles in India.

The British are good people. In all personal dealings they are honest, frank, and reliable. But when national interests are at stake and the interests of the nation dictate a different line of policy, then, they cannot help following the latter, however injustice and hardship they may inflict upon others in doing so. The English political moralist and thinker believes and preaches that the State exists for the people ; that state and people are really interchangeable words and that the teachings of Trietsche that the state is greater than the people and that the latter exist for the former, is immoral and vicious. In Great Britain and Colonies the British act as they believe but in India they follow the doctrine of the German Professor. The state in India is an authority imposed from without and is, therefore, distinct from and independent of the people.* The state in India is the British people and, therefore, the interests of the latter override those of the Indian people. Everything in India is judged by that standard. The English may be good, benevolent, just, kind, and fairminded but all these virtues are dominated by the supreme test mentioned above. All the real troubles of India arise from this circumstance. Everything connected with India is looked at from that angle. Unless that angle changes there is no possibility of any such changes taking place in the system and the policy of the Government of India as are likely to satisfy the self-respect of the Indian or to remove the disadvantages from which the country suffers. At the commencement of the War the British politican and publicist talked a great deal of the readjustment of India's relations with England. Even the Tory Press led by the *Times* made hopeful pronouncements. But the tone

*The *Pioneer* of Allahabad, a semi-official organ of Anglo-Indians, has in a recent issue said that "The safety of the State is and must be of far greater importance than the rights of the individuals."

has since changed and the intervention of the House of Lords in the matter of the U. P. Executive Council, the decision of the Secretary of State about the Punjab Chief Court, and the constitution of the Coalition Cabinet all point to the conclusion that much cannot be built upon the pronouncements made during the early part of the War in the stress of necessity and the exuberance of gratitude for India's "response." We propose, however, to consider briefly the questions that are likely to come up for discussion and decision immediately after the War.

III

The Indian politicans may roughly be divided into three classes.

(a) The Extremists who base their propaganda on fundamental grounds. They do not believe that the British can or will ever grant them freedom of any appreciative kind or any self-government worth the name voluntarily. They are, therefore, opposed to making petitions and sending memorials. Some of them want absolute "Swaraj"; some qualified "Swaraj" on Colonial lines, but every one of them believes that neither is possible except by active revolt or successful passive resistence. They feel that they are not in a position to organise either for some time to come, but that in the meantime it is their duty to do as much as they can, to embarrass the Government by following the tactics of guerilla warfare and by conducting a terrorist campaign. They say they must keep the flag flying no matter how heavy their losses. In their opinion it is the only way to carry on their propaganda and make it effective for impressing the country and gaining fresh recruits to their cause. How far they are wise in their plans is another question.

(b) The Moderates of the Indian National Congress who want to conduct their agitation on constitutional lines within the limits of law are not in favour of embarrassing the Government. The men in power in their party can hardly be distinguished from the third party who are loyalists out and out, and are opposed to all agitation leaving every thing to the good sense of the Government. Good many Moderates believe that after the War the Government will make large political concessions and the

country will make a material advance on the road to self-government on Colonial lines. They have not yet formulated their programme* but the demands that are likely to made may be classified as below.

1. Repeal and modification of the Arms Act, making it possible, at least for men of education and property, to keep arms without licence.

2. Some provision for the military training of the Indian youth.

3. Army commissions to Indians.

4. Improvements in the position and prospects of the Indian soldier.

5. A change in the constitution of the Imperial Executive Council so as to admit of more than one Indian being appointed to it.

6. Changes in the Legislative Councils.

(a) Non-official elected majority in the Viceroy's Council.

(b) Direct election.

(c) Removal of restrictions in the choice of candidates.

(d) Freedom of debate.

(e) Freedom from the embargo of the Secretary of State for India in fiscal legislation.

7. Similar changes in the Provincial Councils with provincial fiscal autonomy and greater freedom in provincial legislation.

8. (a) Executive Councils for the provinces that are without them.

(b) A provision that each Council should have at least two Indian members.

*Since this was written I have seen schemes of Self-Government promulgated by the Congress Committees in the Indian papers. Their burden is autonomy and practical control of Indian affairs by Indians.

(c) That the latter should be elected.

9. Compulsory primary education, with ample provision for technical, commercial and scientific education.

10. Complete separation of judicial from executive functions, with High Courts in place of Chief Courts in the minor provinces also and an extension of jury trials.

11. Governors in place of Lieutenant-Governors and Chief Commissioners in all the provinces.

12. Exclusive or at least larger employment of Indian agency in the Public Services.

13. Inauguration of industries under Government patronage with a protective tariff and ample provision for technical and industrial education in the country.

14. The holding of simultaneous competitive examinations in India for all branches of the Indian Services for which examinations are held in England.

15. The repeal of the Indian Press Act and other coercive and repressive laws put on the statute book within the last ten years.

16. Better treatment in the colonies with freedom of travel and emigration or freedom to bar the colonials from holding any positions in India.

17. Freedom of education.

18. Local-self-government freed of official control from village unions upwards.

Most of these demands will be strongly opposed. Those that touch the fundamental position of the Governmeut as stated before, will be rejected. Minor concessions may be made under heads 3 4 and 9, and something might be done under 16. These concessions, however, will not affect the present position, power, and status of the Government ; nor will they in any way lead to popular control of the Government by the people of India. They will be made in the spirit of kindness and generosity which a master feels towards a servant or slave who has behaved well and served the master with devotion and fidelity. *The fundamental right*

of the people to manage their own affairs and control their Government will not be accepted or conceded in any way. How far this will satisfy the people and check the growth of extremism is to be seen. The probabilities are that the situation will become more serious and grave. Even the concessions likely to be granted will according to the practice of the Government of India, take at least ten years to be put into effect and then will commence a fresh struggle on the part of the bureaucracy to make them nugatory and ineffective and to whittle them down to zero point in the actual working of them. Our past experience justifies all these prognostications and we see no reason to assume that the temperament and the nature of the British rulers of India will undergo material and radical changes after the War. Even now when the War is on and there is acute economic distress in all parts of India and in all ranks of the Indian population below the wealthy; the British services are getting extra war allowances to compensate them for supposed losses caused by refusal of leave *etc.* and for extra work entailed on account of the War, while nothing substantial has been done for the native subordinate.

Thus the ball goes on and will go on unless something happens which makes the British fear they might lose India altogether. Till then, the Indian patriot may hold his soul in patience and may work for the consolidation of his people. It is an extremely hard struggle in which the Indian patriot is engaged. The odds are all against him. The only thing in his favour is the righteousness of his cause. With patience and sacrifice and the grace of God he may some day succeed though the chances of an early success are few and far between.

(c) The third class consists of those who are out and out loyalists and whom the present arrangement places in a position of advantage. Their number is by no means very large and with the increase of political crime in the country their demands for compensation and rewards for loyalty and services are bound to increase which even a despotic government will find it impossible to grant. So there is every possibility of large numbers of them throwing in their lot with the others. It may thus be fairly said that in the demand for substantial self-government the country is practically united and any hesitation or refusal to concede is

bound to tell very adversely on their loyalty.

So far the English have governed India as if there was no one in the world to contest their right to do as they liked. With the advance of nationalism in India and with the turn the politics have taken in the world at large, the British Government in India will have to count with numerous disturbing elements. No body can yet foresee the end of the War. Even the best friends of the Allies are not so sure of their eventual victory as they were some months before. In any case the future is gloomy and even the most optimistic cannot say that Great Britain will emerge altogether unscathed from the War. Even victory would be awfully costly not only in men and in money but also in prestige and influence. Great Britain won against the Boers but that victory reduced their prestige. The present War is, however, going to make a still greater change. The Indians can no longer consider the British to be invincible. The Germans have at least shattered that idea and that fact alone is going to affect seriously British rule in India. The Indians who return from the different seats of War will come back with greater faith in their own fighting power, in their strength and in at least their equality with the white. It will be impossible to keep them in inferior position which they have so far occupied. Last but not the least the Muslim attitude would be entirely different. The talk about ending the War for all times to come is pure and simple nonsense. No one believes it to be possible. In fact there is every possibility of greater complications taking place in European politics as the result of this War. The seeds of future War are being sown and the British will have to be ready for that. A discontented India will be a source of constant danger and weakness and it is for the British statesmanship to decide whether they will like to have a self-governing India as a part of the Empire or lose it altogether. This may be taken for certain that the British cannot govern India on the old lines even for the next ten years. No thoughtful Indian at present is anxious or even willing to seek the aid of a foreign government against the British, but circumstances may change at any moment ending in results disastrous both to England and India. These are matters which we sincerely urge for the consideration of the British statesmen, though we have little hope of their being properly weighed Jingo Imperialsim is a poison

which permeates the system, affects the brain, and disables its victims to think soundly. May we hope that the poison has not yet gone deep enough to make recovery impossible. We say so, not in a spirit of insolence but in one of anxious solicitude for our people as well as the Britishers, among whom we count some of our best and dearest friends.

27. SAVE INDIA FOR THE EMPIRE—AN OPEN LETTER TO DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

I AM an Indian who has, by the fear of your Government in India, been forced to seek refuge in the United States, at least for the period of the War. In 1907, when Lord Minto's Government decided to put into operation an obsolete Regulation of the East India Company (III of 1818) against me, in order to put me out of the way, for a while, without even the form of a trial, Lord Morley, the then Secretary of State for India, defending his action, gave me the highest testimonial as far as my private character was concerned. You must have heard that speech though it would be presumptuous to imagine, that you remember it.

MY CREDENTIALS

Even my worst enemies have not been able to point out anything in my life, which would give any one, even the shadow of a reason, to say that, in my private life, I have not been as good and honourable a person as any British politician or diplomat or proconsul, is or has been or can be. My record as a wage-earner is as clean and as honourable as that of the best of Britishers engaged in governing India.

Mr. H. W. Nevinson, than whom a more truthful and honourable publicist is not known in British life, has said in his work, *The New Spirit in India*,[1] that once when he told a high Anglo-Indian official, that I was a good man held in great esteem by my countrymen, the latter remarked, that because I had a high character in private life, I was the more dangerous as an agitator.

I am reciting all this as evidence of my credentials to speak on behalf of my countrymen. Just now I am a mere exile. For the present, I cannot think of returning to India, unless in course of time I begin to feel that by running the risk of being hanged or

The Open Letter addressed to the Right Honourable David Llyod George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, was issued from New York on 13 June 1917. The entry of the Open Letter into India was banned by the Government of India under the Sea Customs Act.

imprisoned, I should be doing a greater service to my country, than by remaining outside. I am now in the fifty-third year of my life, out of which more than thirty-four were spent in the lime-light of public gaze. I am a man of family with children and grandchildren and have had my share, however small, of the good things of the world. Political freedom for India, has been a passion to me ever since I was a boy. However hard the life of an exile or a convict may be, I am prepared to risk everything in the cause of my country.

In the language of that prince of political exiles, Joseph Mazzini, the word "exile," is perhaps the most cursed in the dictionary of man. It dries up the springs of affection ; it deprives its victims of the sweet babblings and lispings of the little ones with whom every man of age loves to beguile the evening of his days; it closes the avenues of all comfort that are associated with that sweet word home ; it shuts the doors of heaven and makes life a continued agony, hanging on the slender thread of such pity and hospitality, as one may receive from the generous and kind-hearted foreigner.

INDIA COMPARED WITH GREAT BRITAIN

How can I ask you who have perhaps never left your country except for some pleasant trips on the Continent, to put yourself in my position, if possible, for a moment only, and imagine how I long to kiss the soil, with which are mixed the bones of my mother and other forbears ; how I miss the loving embrace of my beloved father, the sweet, expectant, imploring eyes of my widowed daughter, the devoted look of my wife and the kindly affectionate hand-shake of good and devoted friends. Nor can you realize how an Indian loves his country. How can you, of dark, sombre, fog-ridden and misty climes, who are born of a chill atmosphere, of treacherously changing weather, who count hours of sunshine and months of darkness and fog and rain and snow and sleet, enter into the feelings of one whose country is a perpetual sunshine, and where, universal light reigns—a country where weather is neither treacherous nor continually and rapidly changing, where beautiful dawns, starry nights, moonlit fields, resplendent waters, snowclad hills and joyous rivers constantly and unremittingly fill one's mind with the sublimity, grandeur and beauty of nature ; where one needs no stimulants to make him feel lighter and happier. An Indian

needs no alcohol to forget his troubles. He has only to go to the Himalaya, or to the banks of Ganga, Brahmputra, Sindh or their numerous tributaries by which the land is blessed and fertilized. Oh no ! It is impossible for you to understand how passionately an Indian loves his country. He would rather starve in India than be a ruler of men in a foreign climate. For him, India is the land of Gods—the Deva-Bhumi of his forefathers. It is the land of knowledge, of faith, of beatitude—the Gian-Bhumi, the Dharma-Bhumi and the Punya-Bhumi of the ancient Aryas. It is the land of the Vedas and of the heroes—the Veda-Bhumi and the Vir-Bhumi of his ancestors. Yes, to him, it is the land of lands, the only place where he wishes to live, and more so, where he wishes to die. For a Hindu to die anywhere but in India, is as if he had been damned to hell. He shudders at the idea. To him, it is unthinkable. You may call it foolish, unpractical, sentimental and unprogressive ; but there it is—a mighty fact of life into which no foreigner can penetrate.

Every Englishman loves his country, its darkness, its fog, its sleet and rain nothwithstanding. Who does not love his country and who does not say :

Home, kindred, friends and country—these
    Are ties with which we never part ;
From clime to clime, o'er land and seas,
    We bear them in our heart ;
But, oh ! 'tis hard to feel resigned,
    When they must all be left behind !

J. Montgomery

If then, an Indian decides to be an exile, voluntarily and may be for life, he only does so either under a grave sense of duty or of danger. The duty lies in speaking the truth about political conditions in India and the danger in being effectively prevented from doing so if he remains there. No Indian can speak the whole truth while in India. The criminal laws of your Government—your Penal and Criminal Codes, Seditious Meetings and Conspiracy Acts, and Press Laws, your tribunals—presided over by your own people unaided by jurors—effectively gag his mouth.

All honour to those who, though they cannot speak the whole truth, yet keep the fire burning in India and do as much as

considerations of policy and expediency permit. If they do not speak the whole truth, they have at least the consolation of being at home, in the heart of their family and surrounded by their dear ones. For a political exile, l owever, there is nothing else to do, unless he has to carry on a fight for his living also, in which case he will divide his time between the two, that of earning bread and crying for justice for his country. Happily, I have been comparatively free from much anxiety about the first. The only justification for my condition of exile, then, is that I continue to speak the truth about conditions in India and draw the attention of the world to them.

But an additional reason has just been furnished to me by the morning papers of March 15, 1917. It is said that your agents in India have decided to raise a war loan of $ 500,000,000, equivalent to 1,500,000,000 Rupees of Indian money, and also, to make the floating of the loan easy, your Government has agreed to increase the duty on cotton imports by 4% ad valorem. This war loan, it is added, would be a 'free gift'' of India to Great Britain[2] ! A free gift of $ 500,000,000 by starving, poverty-stricken India, to rich, wealthy, mighty Great Britain ! Could anything be more astounding, more absurd and more tyrannical. The news has stunned me. I know that David Llyod George, the British war-lord of 1917, is not the same person who was the radical Chancellor of Exchequer in the Liberal Government from 1908 to 1914, and who did magnificent service to the British workingman by reducing his burdens and alleviating his condition. I have been told that the said David Llyod George is dead and you, sir, are an entirely different person. The Llyod George of 1914 could not possibly have done the thing which you, sir, in alliance with Curzons and Milners have just accomplished. The newspapers say you are the same person ; only you have changed. If so, the change is not of opinion but of personality. Evidently the soul of the original David Llyod George has left the body to make room for an altogether different soul. We Indians believe in the possibility of such a metamorphosis taking place even in the lifetime of the same body ! The best part of the joke, however, in connection with the £ 100,000,000 transaction lies in the fact that you call it a gift by India—a gift indeed. A gift like those given by Belgium to Germany. Is it not so, Mr. George?

You are a shrewd person, very well educated, clever in diplomacy, well versed in tricks of speech and a master in statecraft; but even you ought to know that this trick will not deceive any one—not even the Indians who have been so often deceived by your predecessors in business. By way of adding insult to injury, you profess to do "an act of justice" to India by consenting to an increase of 4% on the duty leviable on imports of cotton goods. You say it is necessary for the success of the war loan of $ 500,000,000 ; but do you think that the Indians are so devoid of knowledge of the ordinary rules of arithmetic as not to understand what this "hitting below the belt" means to them ? Your additional duty would but bring only $ 5,000,000 or $ 6,000,000 to the Indian exchequer, if the imports of cotton do not undergo a decrease. Your Government in India estimates it at £ 1,000,000 sterling. The interest at 5½% amouuts to $ 27,500,000. Your Government in India estimates an annual charge of £ 6,000,000 sterling. Where is the balance to come from except from the famished Indian ryot ? Is that how you show your love for democracy, for the people at large, for the workingman ? Your representatives in India and outside, are proclaiming to the world that India is the most lightly taxed country in the world, withholding the fact that the average income of an Indian is only £ 2 a year, of which he pays 7 shillings towards taxes. That was before the new taxes were imposed.

Your publicists circulate another lie, *viz.*, that India pays no tribute, while they know that from 20 to 40 millions sterling are remitted to England every year, out of which only a portion represents interest on loans made to India for the building of railways which your countrymen have used in developing their trade, and the remainder is the profit you make out of India. Then you cite the figures of trade in support of your theory that India is prosperous under British rule, but you forget that that trade benefits your country more than it benefits India, if at all. We send you food and raw materials at cheapest prices, making ourselves liable to "famines". You pay us in articles of luxury, of flimsy value, at the highest prices. The balance of trade is always in your favour. We toil and sweat, and your countrymen enjoy the profit. All the paying industries, railway, tea, jute, half of the cotton industry, *etc.*, are in the hands of your countrymen. Theirs are

the insurance companies, banks, railways and ships that profit by their trade. The railway rates discriminate against native industries and internal trade. Your countrymen get the plumpudding, while our people cannot have even two meals of the coarsest food every day. When there is famine, millions die. Of late. your "scientific" methods of famine relief have succeeded in controlling mortality figures in famine days. The method by which you do this is genuinely scientific. Most of the deaths are charged to epidemics and disease; no one notices, however, that the havoc caused by disease is due to lack of nourishment and consequent low vitality. God-fearing Englishmen have cried themselves hoarse over the situation. The misery of the Indian masses has been pictured by their powerful pens in pathetic and soul-stirring words, but you and your colleagues still continue to ignore what they have said. New methods are every day being invented to exploit us. New departments with fat salaries for Englishmen are being multiplied. The public debt is being piled up. While hundreds of millions are spent on railways, nothing has been done to develop local industries. The country is suffering from lack of captial (cash & credit). (See Sir D. M. Hamilton's article in the *Calcutta Review* for July, 1916). Every honest inquirer who makes inquiries on the spot and does not depend on the reports of your officials, finds and reports that the condition of the masses is the most pitiable (see the article by Mr. Manohar Lal in the *Allahabad Economic Journal* for April, 1916, and also the paper by Mr. Patro, of Madras, read in a meeting presided over by the Governor of Madras). For the latest British testimony on the point, see an article on Indian Industrial Development by Mr. Moreland, C. S. I., C. I. E., in the *Quarterly Review* for April, 1917, in the course of which he remarks : "It is a matter of common knowledge that the standard of life in India is undesirably low ; that while the masses of the people are provided with the bare necessities of life, of a bare existence (Are they ? L. R.) they are, in far too many cases badly housed and badly clothed, badly doctored and badly taught, often overworked and often underfed ; and that the present income, even if it were equitably distributed, would not suffice to provide the population with even the most indispensable elements of a reasonable life."

A careful study of the Reports on Prices and Wages discloses that the real living wage in the case of the vast bulk of agricultural

labourers has considerably diminished, and this in spite of the absurd conclusion of the Prices Commission[3] appointed by your Government a few years ago. No one knows better than you, Mr. David Llyod George, that big buildings in cities, mostly owned by foreign capitalists exploiting the country ; big trade carried on by foreign exporters and importers ; railway mileage and receipts of Government revenue do not mean prosperity. Even the importation of treasure secured by capitalists in payment for exports does not indicate better conditions of the masses. If the masses are so prosperous, as your officers say, why cannot you tax the people for purposes of education and sanitation ? Why is the death rate so high (over 30 per thousand) ? Why can't you force the local bodies to spend money on education and sanitation ? Why do your finance ministers say that there is no room for further taxes ? Most of your agents in India know the real condition of the people but they have to conceal it from the British public as well as the world, as that enables them and their kin to continue in the enjoyment of that power which means so much to them.

In reply, you might well ask, why then is India loyal ? Why do the people put up with all this ? Why don't they rebel ? Because they have been emasculated, and emasculated so completely, that they are absolutely helpless against your organized brigandage. They are weak, ignorant and incompetent. Sixty-four years ago they were not so helpless. But now they are completely demoralized and penniless. Your system has ground them into dust. They cannot even protect themselves from wild beasts. You have completely disarmed them. No Indian can possess a firearm except under a licence from your magistrate, which is only rarely granted. You have completely hypnotized them by your professions of distinterested liberalism and altruism. The truth has, after all, dawned on them that you are the worst harpies they ever have had and if they could they would overthrow you without a scruple. You know that you are safe in their helplessness. When the War came they deluded themselves with the hope that in your hour of need you might accord them a better treatment, but by this time they have found their mistake and have concluded that, just as a lion may die of sheer exhaustion when attacked by an enemy rather than willingly loosen his grip on his prey so long as there is breath in his body, so a nation holding another in subjection might endanger

her own existence without loosening her grip on her victim.

When the War broke out in August 1914, I, with other Indian publicists, thought that however badly you had treated us in the past we had nothing to gain by German victory and the best thing, under the circumstances, was for us to stand by you and establish our claim to better treatment. The Princes and people of India, therefore, stood by you. You and your colleagues have been singing their praises and extolling their loyalty, but nothing has been done so far to give them even the elementary political rights of a free people. Verily, we have had a deluge of fine words but not an iota of deeds. On the other hand, you have imposed fresh burdens on us. While doing an "act of justice" about the cotton duties you have committed a wrong which wipes away the little good that might otherwise have been expected to accrue therefrom. Your courts and officers in India have taken away what little freedom the people enjoyed before. In cases of alleged sedition the sentences inflicted have been quite on a par with the doings of the Romanoffs in Russia. This time even women have felt your steel.

You know as well as anyone else does, how the German Government has been trying to win the goodwill of the Indians. It cannot be denied that the temptation was alluring. If, then, we have withstood it, it was not because we were in love with your Government in India, but on different grounds. Personally, I do not believe that any liberty is worth having which we cannot win ourselves, because liberty won by the aid of another places us at the mercy of that other. European diplomacy is so crooked that it is futile to place faith in the promises of any of them.

I would esteem German friendship as much as British or American or that of the Japanese or the Chinese ; I would gratefully accept any help anybody would render in educating and fitting our young men for the coming task, but I would not do anything that would cause useless bloodshed in India. I am not afraid of blood. Blood will have to be shed if we are to gain our freedom. I am not afraid of failures and defeats. Failures and defeats are sometimes the necessary steps to victory. I do not believe in peace at any price ; nor pacificism at any cost. I do not believe that "they also serve who only stand and wait." I am for a manly assertion of our rights, even though blood may have to be

spilled in asserting or defending them ; yet I would consider it highly improper to encourage bloodshed where there is not a ghost of a chance of success. That, in my eyes, is sheer lunacy and I have never made a secret of it. So I protested against my people attempting to stir up revolt in India, under the instigation of a foreign government. It was due to my horror of useless bloodshed. I have no doubt that *agents provacateur* played an important part in instigating those whom your courts have found guilty and sent to the gallows. I believe that the men who have been sacrificed should have lived and worked for the movement for which they have died. So that, in a nutshell, gives you my attitude towards foreign help. Remember, please, sir, that I do not presume to pronounce any judgment on those who think differently and have acted in the light of their consciences. I simply state my opinion and my attitude.

This time the movement has failed. It was bound to fail. But the experience which the Indians engaged in the cause have gained is not lost. Next time, and who knows the chance may come at no distant date, they will profit by the experience thus gained. The world is not in love with you, sir. There are a dozen peoples in the world who will be glad to see your downfall and help in bringing it about. They will not support the Indian Nationalist and the Indian Revolutionist openly, but they will encourage him in every way they can, without bringing about diplomatic complications. So the Indian will not be altogether friendless when the next opportunity to strike comes. By that time the country also will be better prepared to do something more definite and more spectacular.

Under the circumstances, the question that I wish to put to you is : "Would you do nothing to avert it ?" It is in your power to act if you will. The Indians are very easily satisfied. They abhor bloodshed. They do not like revolution. They will gladly remain in the Empire, if permitted to do so on terms of self-respect and honour. Their needs are few. Their life is simple. They care more for spiritual values than for worldly goods. They envy nobody's property. They have no ambition to start on a career of exploitation. All they want is to be let to live and think as they will. At present they are let to exist, but not to live. More than 100 million are insufficiently fed. At least 60 millions

do not get two meals a day. More than 80% of the boys receive no schooling, and more than 90% of the girls. They work and toil and sweat primarily in the interests of the British capitalist and secondarily in the interests of his Indian colleague. The latter only gets the leavings of the former. The ships, the railways, the leading banking houses, the big insurance offices, the tea plantations, one-half of the cotton mills, about all the woollen mills, most of the paper mills, all jute mills are owned by the former ; a few by the latter. The profits of agriculture are divided between your Government and the big landlords. The pressure on land has reduced the size of the ryots' holdings, while the number of mouths requiring food and the number of bodies requiring clothing has increased.

Your Government encourages drinking, speculating and gambling in a way never before conceived. If you have any pity in your heart, sir ; if you are a good father and a good husband, I would beseech you to devote but an hour's time to the wages tables printed by your Government in their Report on Prices & Wages (1915). I give a few samples below :

In the district of Patna (Behar), the monthly wage of an able-bodied agricultural labourer in the year 1907 was only Rs. 5.62 (say R6) equal to 8s. or $2. In 1873 it was from R3 to R4. Imagine the labourer having a family of four and then conceive how he manages to live on this wage. In Fyzabad (Oude) the monthly wage of an able-bodied agricultural labourer was only R4 (5s. 4d. or $1.33) in 1905, the same as it was in 1873. In 1906 it is given as ranging from R1.87 to R4 a month. From 1873 to 1906 it was never more than R4 a month.

In Cawnpore (U. P.) it was R3.75 in 1873 ; R3 in 1892 ; less than 4 in 1896 ; from 3.44 to R5 in 1898 and from R3.69 to 7 in 1903 ; at which figure it practically stayed up to 1906, the last year for which figures are given in the report.

In Meerut (U. P.) it was R4.33 in 1906 as against R4.5 in 1873.

In Belgaum (Bombay) it was R6.25 in 1912.

In Jubbulpore (C. P.) it was R5 in 1908.

In Raipur (C. P.) it was R5 in 1908.

In Bellary (Madras) it was R4.75 in 1907.

In Salem (Madras) it has never exceeded R3.67 since 1873.

The Government postal runners who carry mails at a trotting pace for several miles a day, often making two trips in 24 hours, are paid the following salaries in the different provinces of your Indian Empire :—

Bengal	1913,	R7.75	a month	$ 2.58
Behar & Orissa	,,	6.33	,,	2.10
United Provinces	,,	6.25	,,	2.08
Punjab and N. W. F.	,,	7.75	,,	2.58
Bombay	,,	7.5	,,	2.35
Central Provinces	,,	7.	,,	2.33
Madras	,	7.11	,,	2.40

(The equivalents in dollars are approximate).

Postmen who are supposed to be literate, received from R 10 to R 16 a month (*i.e.* from $ 3.33 to $ 5.33 a month) in the different provinces in 1913.

The scale of wages allowed to unskilled labour in the railway yards of Mirzapore and Cawnpore (U. P) is given between R5 to R6 per month (*i.e.*, less than $ 2.00). These are figures of 1914.

In the canal foundry and workshop at Roorkee (U. P.) the daily wage in 1916 was only 4 annas a day, *i. e.*, 8 cents).

In the Cawnpore saddlery establishment, the bullock drivers, the sweepers and the Bhishties received only R5 and R6 a month (*i.e.*, less than 8s. or $ 2.00) ; the lascars from R6 to R7 (*i.e.*, $ 2.00 to $ 2.33).

In the woolen mills in Northern India unskilled labour was paid at R8.12 (*i.e.*, less than $ 3.00) a month in 1914. These are rates allowed in big cities. For other big cities the rates may, in some cases, be somewhat better, but in small rural towns and villages, they are considerably less.

Does the Indian labourer, considering his standard of life, the size of his family and the requirements of decency, get a living wage ? I am sure that a humane inquirer, not so much interested in the good name of the Government as in truth, will have no hesitation in answering the question in the negative. Any increase in wages has to be divided over the average strength of a family.

which will show how disproportionate the increase in wages is to the increase in prices. In a family of five with one or two earning hands the increase in wages is two-fold at the most. While the increase in the cost of living by the increase in prices is five-fold. Your Official Report writers always ignore this important consideration. As for the housing conditions in which Indian workmen live, let me present to you the following testimony from a recent issue of the *Times of India*, Bombay (quoted in the *London Times*, *June* 1917) :

"It is no unusual sight to find fifteen or twenty persons, of both sexes, lying huddled on the floor of a single room in a stifling atmosphere and a vile stench. A single small window or an open door gives the only ventilation. Furniture there is none, beyond a few brass pots and some pegs. The sanitary arrangements are unspeakable. Every noise and smell that occurs in the neighbourhood penetrates the crazy walls and floor and disturbs the sleepers. The chawls are often so rickety that it is a miracle that they do not collapse under their own weight. They seem to be kept up like a house of cards, by the support of their scarcely less rickety neighbours."

As for the Indian labourer getting any education or any leisure for art or for the pursuit of taste, that is out of the question. The condition of the small farmer or ryot is even worse. Sir, If you are ever inclined to study the actual conditions of life in India, do not rely upon the "conclusions" of your officers as embodied in reports. Study the facts, given in the reports, but disregard the conclusions. If you seek the aid of an Indian Nationlist he may show you how the reports are drawn up, and how dates and figures have been selected to suit conclusions. Having been a lawyer most of your life you are well aware of the magical properties of special pleading. In the hands of a skillful apologist, the figures can be made to mean anything. Better still, if you want to have a glimpse of conditions of life in India, depute an honest man of the type of Mr. Nevinson to go to Indian villages unaccompanied by officials, and see the things for himself ; or to the slums in towns. The slums of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Lahore, Delhi, Cawnpore, Lucknow, Banares, will throw the slums of London and New York far back into the shade. The latter are verily a paradise as compared with the former. As to the

villages, the less said the better. The point is in fact conceded by all fairminded English publicists.

The *Manchester Guardian*, only the other day, discussing the recent increase in the cotton duties, questioned "the wisdom and justice" of this £ 100,000,000 exaction from India and admitted that "the loss it represents to an extremely poor pupulation like that of India is very much greater than the gain to England." Even the *Morning Post*, that representative of jingo Imperialism, recognizes the extreme poverty of the masses of India. I will not quote the *Nation* as you do not like that journal. The moneyed classes of India, the Rajas and Maharajas, the bankers and mill owners, the industrial corporations that will fill this loan could not find more profitable investment. They get 100 per cent. stock for 95 and besides get from 5 to 5½ per cent. interest, in some cases free of income tax for thirty years to come. Upon whom will the burden of interest fall ? Neither on the lender nor on the borrower, but mainly on the ryot and the labourer. Do you know, sir, that the average price of salt (wholesale) in Lahore, Punjab, had risen from Rl-9-7 a maund in 1912-13 to R2-7-3 in 1916-17 ? But that in retail sale "the average price of salt per maund (82 lbs.) had risen from Rl-14-0 to R5-0-0" (The *Tribune*, Lahore, March, 1917). The fresh taxation imposed since the War, which by this loan-cum-gift transaction of 100 million sterling threatens to become permanent, has raised the prices of the necessaries of life to an abnormal extent. The wages remain virtually the same. Your Government which employs large numbers of labouring men in railways, canals, and otherwise have not considered it necessary to raise the wages of the workingmen. Will the private employer do otherwise ? I know from personal knowledge how frightfully the poor Indian clerk is sweated in the offices of your Government in India on a mere pittance. Can't you feel for the millions of those little ones whose already scanty, insufficient food is still further reduced by the fresh taxes imposed by your Government to find means to pay the War budget and this permanent addition of £ 6,000,000 a year to their burden ? Don't you know, sir, that in India there are millions of widows (much more than in any other country) who have to support their little ones by their own toil and that every penny of additional taxation hits them

hard. The hardships and privations imposed in Europe by the War are nothing as compared with what the Indian masses have been putting up with, for the last fifty years or so. The fiscal policy of your Government has ruined Indian industry. You know it as well as anyone else. Did you notice the letter of Mr. G. W. Forrest in the *London Times* of March 14, 1917, wherein he admitted that "the tale of England's dealing with Indian Industry was one of littleness and injustice," and that "by positive prohibition and heavy duties the Indian textile trade in England was destroyed and our own trade was fostered." You and your colleagues have used grandiloquent rhetoric in your defence of the increase in the cotton duties in India and over your concern for India and Indian industries, but you are mistaken if you think that anyone in India is likely to be taken in by your hypocritical professions. Pardon me, sir, I mean no insult when I say "hypocritical professions." The practice is a part of a modern statesman's job. He has to create a certain atmosphere before he can make his people believe that what he does is the only correct thing to do.

Your cotton duties, sir, afford no relief to the Indian poor. It would not have hurt me much, if you had forced or induced the Rajas and the Maharajas, the bankers and the capitalists to contribute even more than 100 million pounds to the War expenses, as it is they who have grown fat, if anyone in India has, under the British regime, but to force the Indian ryot and the Indian wage earner to do it and to continue to pay for it for years to come out of his scanty daily rations is the climax of cruelty. Then the unkindest cut of all is that it should come from you. whom we had associated with feelings of kindness, and pity, for the poor and the workmen.

Your Government has called it a free and spontaneous gift of the people of India ! If the members of your Cabinet, if the Secretary of State for India, if the Governor-General of India and his ministers of the Executive Council, are the people of India, then truly you are right and we wrong. If they are not the people of India, as they are not, then it is a gift by yourself, of other peoples' money. Again, the statement that the measure was unanimously approved of by the Indian members of the Council is a diplomatic lie. You know that the matter was settled between your Cabinet as represented by the Secretary of State for

India and the Viceroy's Executive Council (which includes only one Indian member nominated by you), before it was announced in the Legislative Council. You know also, sir, and if you don't, you ought to, that the Indian Legislative Council has no power under the law to make any changes in the budget. The budget is entirely beyond their purview. The members can only extol it or criticise it. They can propose resolutions disapproving of some of its provisions which can amount to nothing more than pious wishes even if passed. But the official majority in the Council guarantees the defeat of any hostile resolutions by non-official members. Regarding this loan-cum-gift transaction, the non-offical members of the Legislative Council put a seal on their mouths because they thought it was useless to incur the risk of being called disloyal for a matter which was reported to them as a *fait accompli* and which they could not in any way change or modify ; yet two of them did raise a sort of feeble protest.

IT IS NOT A GIFT BY THE PEOPLE OF INDIA

The press comments on it, however subdued and timid and halting, leave no doubt about the real mind of India in the matter. The truth has been pointed out by the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Nation.* (Beg your pardon, sir, for mentioning the *Nation* again). The former, in its issue of March 15, remarked : "It is we, who govern India and not the Indian people. The initiative in all financial proposals necessarily comes from the government we appoint in India, and these cannot reach the light of public discussion in the Legislative Council or elsewhere until they have received the sanction of the Secretary of State for India here. For Mr. Chamberlain to throw off upon Indian people the responsibility for originating and devising the 100 million contribution is as unconvincing a rhetorical exercise as the House of Commons has witnessed for many a long day. The responsibility from the first to the last is his and that of the Indian Government. We have said more than once, and we repeat it that in our opinion a wise statesmanship would both find better uses in India for India's millions and employ India more advantageously for the common cause by using more of her manhood and less of her money." I will not quote the *Nation,* sir, which is on this point as explicit, if not more, as the *Manchester Guardian.*

Now, sir, you know that India has been very eager to fight for the Empire. She has supplied you with about 350,000 troops in this War, paying for their services and equipment herself. But 350,000, do not represent even a fraction of her man power, the whole of which she was prepared to throw in this struggle. While Australia and Canada and Ireland have either rejected conscription or are shirking, India has been clamouring for it. You can no longer say that you could not utilize India's manhood because of the prejudice of colour. That shibboleth has been shattered by this War and, we hope, for good. The coloured people of Asia and Africa are fighting in numbers alongside of the best European troops. Poor people! They believe they are fighting to make the world "safe for democracy"! You cannot say that Indians are lacking in fighting qualities, because the existence of them in a high degree they have proved conclusively in face of difficulties, by no means light and contemptible. That the Indian soldier can hold his own in Europe, even better than the European soldier in Southern Asia, has been established beyond the shadow of a doubt by the experiences of this War. Why, then, won't you use India's manhood and relieve her of this financial exaction which she can ill afford to meet, without suffering egregiously?

INDIA'S TEEMING MILLIONS WANT FOOD AND KNOWLEDGE OF THREE R'S

The question for India's teeming millions is not "how to live well" but how to live at all. There is no question of comforts for them. What they want, and do not get, is sufficient and nourishing food and a knowledge of the three R's. Your Government is unable to give them the first, and persists in refusing to give them the second; yet when an Indian publicist loses patience and says "slavery has deprived Indians of wealth, honours and freedom, and has reduced them to destitution and starvation," your Viceroy in India cites it as an instance of depraved journalism and a justification for the gagging of the press. He complains that "there are papers in India which magnify the ills from which she suffers" and "which harp upon plague, famine, malaria and poverty" and "ascribe them all to the curse of an alien government." May I ask, sir, if it is not a fact that millions in India die of famine, plague, and malaria? Is it not a fact that the causes

and the appalling effects of them, are directly or indirectly traceable to poverty ? Many countries on the face of the earth do not grow food sufficient for themselves while India does. Why then should India alone suffer from famines when her food supply, once in a while, falls short of the ordinary year of agricultural "prosperity ?" If even during famine years India can supply food to other nations by exports of wheat and other grains, why can't she keep that food at home and feed her own hungry children ? Why should plague have stayed in India so long ? Why should malaria exact such a heavy annual toll there ? The reason is obvious. Because of the ignorance and poverty of the people.

Let us assume that India has not grown poorer under British rule, though there is abundant evidence to the contrary, that the masses have become poorer and are becoming poorer every day ; let us also assume that in the matter of education India was worse off under native rule—*i.e.*, before the introduction of the British rule—a period of history when no other part of the world was any the better. Is it not a matter of shame, that after 150 years of British rule, when most of the other national governments in other parts of the world have reduced their illiteracy almost to zero point, India should still have more than 90% of its population illiterate ? Is it not a matter of shame, that of all the grain producing countries of the world India alone should be so miserably situated as to be unable to supply sufficient and nourishing food to her sons and daughters ? Don't you think, sir, that the Indians have reason to feel sore when they see that the food grown by them is denied to them ; that it is almost snatched from their mouths ; that others should eat the food which is grown by them, that even in the best of years millions of them must be contented with only one meal a day, and that of the coarsest grain.

Do you remember, Mr. Llyod George, how bitter you felt against the capitalist, when you yourself in your boyhood, felt the pinch of want ? Have you forgotten all that you said in the Limehouse speech ? I repeat that the sufferings of the British labourer and workingmen, the trials of the British poor are nothing compared with those of the Indian ryot and the Indian workingmen and the Indian clerks in your employ in that country. Yet you have no feeling to spare for them. and those that have, you and your Government brand as malcontents and seditionists.

Don't you think, sir, that the Indian ryot and the Indian poor are being crushed under the weight of two capitalisms superimposed upon each other—one foreign and the other indigenous ? When we ask for freedom to manage our own affairs you say we are not fit to do so. But what can we do to ourselves which will be worse than what you have done us ? If left free, we might bring to book the indigenous capitalists whom, in the interests of your own capitalists, you have been supporting and fattening. But even if we fail to do so, we shall at any rate have upon us the burden of only a single weight. Your colleagues say that in refusing self-government to India they are actuated by devotion to India ; that they do not want to hand over the millions of India to the tender mercies of a small minority of educated and wealthy men in whose hands the government will inevitably drift. Supposing it does, it will be easy for the masses to keep the minority in check. They can revolt and rebel, but under your Government the bureaucracy is all powerful. The truth is, sir, that the condition of these very millions, in whose interests, you say, you are reluctant to give power to the educated and the wealthy few, is a standing condemnation of your government there. The educated minority and the wealthy few are fairly well off under your regime. It is the ignorant ryot and the millions of workingmen and women who suffer. In the words of one of your distinguished writers (W. Lily), they do not live but just exist.

Recently the *Times* said that the British were "the trustees of the welfare of India's millions." Who are these millions for whom you are trustees ? Are they those homeless, educationless millions who get only one meal a day or are they those who have benefited from your schools and are wealthy ? If the former, you have failed in your trust. If the latter, they are quite fit to manage their own affairs. It was only the other day that Mr. Austen Chamberlain was reported to have said (*Times*, London, March 30) at luncheon given to him and the India's so-called representatives at the Imperial Conference[4] (one of whom was a Lieutenant-Governor interested in extending India's sphere of subjection) that "India will not remain and ought not to remain content to be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for the rest of the Empire." Noble words these, full of hope and encouragement. But what a sad and crushing acknowledgment of the present helpless condition of India.

It is a truthful statement for which the Indians ought to be grateful to Mr. Chamberlain. At the present moment India is a mere "hewer of wood and a drawer of water" for the rest of the Empire. Against that her sons protest, and will continue to protest, as long as the wrongs of the country are not redressed, your press act, your sedition laws, jails and prisons notwithstanding.

The position, Mr. Llyod George, is pathetic. When we ask for more outlay on education, you say, no, the condition of the finances will not permit of that. When we point out the way to find finances, you say, "no further taxes are possible and retrenchment in public expenditure in other departments undesirable." When we say, "give us the management and we will do it," you say, "no, you are unfit." The result is that you will neither educate the masses yourself nor will you let us educate them. Yet you hold their ignorance a valid ground for refusing us our right to manage our own affairs. When, however, you want money for Imperial purposes you raise loans, impose taxes, and reduce public expenditure on education and public works. You have done this not only now, for the purposes of this bloody War, but you have done so in the past in building railways for your merchants and to fight your wars in Africa, in China, in Afghanistan, in fact, all over the old world. It is true the present is a trying time for you and you may have a pretence of justification in this crisis in your Imperial life. But so long as you refuse the conscription of wealth in your home islands, what right have you to impose this conscription of India's money resources? You have not forced the dominions to make monetary contributions. In fact you have advanced them over £ 140,000,000 from your own funds. You have not so far called upon the British capitalists to pay even a fraction of their wealth. You have simply taxed their excessive profits. Why should you have made an exception in the case of India? India is the poorest part of the Empire. Yet it is she who has been selected for this exceptional treatment. She had already made lavish gifts of money and provisions and equipment. Her gifts were in entire disproportion to her means. Compared with your dominions' resources and their money sacrifices India's contribution stood higher than those of the former. Yet you selected India for this compulsory money contribution because India is the only part of the Empire which you could

thus treat. India is the only part of the Empire which has been forced to give $ 500,000,000 as a free gift. Even the fabulously rich United States have made huge war profits from you and your other allies have not thought of a national gift. Yet imperial sophistry, represented by your imperial publicists and officials, represent that Great Britian exacts no tribute from India and makes no profit out of her connection with India and that she rules India simply out of philanthropic and humanitarian motives.

WASTE

One would have thought that under the pressure of the War, your Government in India would make an honest and earnest effort to reduce expenditure on public services, at least under heads mainly ornamental or which only afford luxuries to your agents in India; but on the other hand, what is the actual situation? A perusal of the proceedings of the Imperial Legislative Council and also of the Provincial Councils shows that all efforts made by the non-official members to obtain additional money for education and sanitation by the reduction of expenditure on luxuries, were opposed by your Government, and were consequently defeated. All efforts to reduce expenditure on comforts were of course resisted by those who enjoyed them, and it is they whose votes count in the Indian Councils. For example, it was proposed that the huge expenditure incurred by the different Government Departments, Imperial & Provincial, in moving to the hills for seven months of the year, should be reduced, at least partially. Many persons competent to express an opinion on the subject, among them Lord Carmichael, the retiring Governor of Bengal, have placed it on record that this "exodus to the hills" was not necessary, and was in fact prejudicial to the interests of good government; yet the Government opposed the motion of the non-official member and he was forced to withdraw it. A similar motion to curtail the expenditure on the ornamentation of the residence of the Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces was also opposed and met a similar fate. The huge allowances made to the heads of the different governments in India for kitchen expenses, for dispensing hospitality, and for travelling in royal style have not been reduced by a penny. The Punjab Government has provided in its current budget a large

amount of money for providing palatial residences for its officers in summer resorts, and has sanctioned large pensions, from father to son, for a few of their Indian supporters. These men are mostly wealthy men. They did nothing more than help you in your suppressive and exploiting policy. Your Government naturally rewards them. Is it not bribery ? If an expert financier were to examine into these items, which can only pass unchallenged in a country wherein the people have no voice in the raising of the taxes and in spending them, it would be found that great savings could be effected and the money thus made available used for other urgent needs of the people. The fact is that the Indian ryot who pays for all these extravagances has no voice to check the vagaries of those who spend his money for their own comforts. I have not mentioned the lavish scale on which special travelling allowances are granted to high officials in India. It is a matter of common knowledge that these officials do not spend as much as they draw under this head. Yet it is actually proposed that the salaries and the allowances for the European members of the Indian services be substantially raised. Verily, taxation without representation is a crime of the worst possible kind.

DEMOCRACY

Mr. Lloyd George, you and your colleagues in the Government of Great Britain, say that in fighting the Germans you are fighting the battle of Democracy, to make the world safe from autocracy and militarism, that you are fighting for rights of small nations, and for the domination of right over might. The United States has joined the War for the same reason. I have seen numerous recruiting posters exhibited in New York City exhorting young Americans to enlist in the army "to make the world safe" for Democracy. I have not the slightest doubt of the sincerity of the American professions because their international record is so far clean, vide their record in Cuba and the Philippines. Can we say the same for Great Britain ? I am afraid not, so long at least, as you continue to deny self-government to India, the second of the two biggest democracies of the world. Here is a nation of 315 million human beings (or say several nations, if you wish, as your publicists are so fond of repeating *ad nauseam* that India is not a nation) whom you are governing

by the force of might, without their consent, and on absolutely despotic lines ; whom you deny freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of education ; whom you tax without their consent and then spend those taxes outside of their country, and in providing luxuries to your representatives in India or in bribing such Indians as uphold you in your possessions. I have no doubt that you are sincere in your denunciation of German militarism. For myself I have no use for Czars and Kaisers, Emperors and Sultans, and I dare say that you, too, have none. Thus I am in full sympathy with your efforts to exterminate the race of Kaisers. So far you are right. But an Indian cannot help smiling rather cynically when he hears you saying that you are waging the War to make the world safe for Democracy. Your conduct in India and in Egypt, and in Persia belies your protestations.

AS TO SMALL NATIONS

In defending your conduct you urge that India is not a nation. Very well, sir, divide India into small nations and give them self-government separately. You will admit that there are parts of India which are homogenous, entitled to be called small nations in the sense in which Belgium, Switzerland, Denmark, and Holland are. The bulk of the population follow the same religion, speak the same language and belong to the same race. Remember, please, that I do not admit that India is not a nation or that the sameness of language, religion and race is necessary for a political national existence. Switzerland, Canada, the United States, South Africa, Russia and Austria-Hungary have demolished that theory.

The apologists of the present system of Government in India say that the Indian people are not sufficiently educated in the principles and practice of politics and that their ignorance and illiteracy make it necessary for the British to continue to rule them from without, until they are fit to establish and maintain a democratic form of government. I have already made some remarks about illiteracy and shown that the responsibility for it rests on your shoulders. If you, sir, are to be the sole judge of the educational requirements of the Indian people, their progress is bound to hang on your convenience. No one in possession is anxious to be dispossessed and if the time and method of his dispossession is to be determined by himself, then woe to the dispossessed ! But, sir, you forget that literacy is not education. The Indian masses have a

background of centuries of culture which places them in the matter of intelligence and character, in a better position than even the literate millions of European and American countries. And after all, it is intelligence and culture that count most in the fixing of final values.

As for their training in political life, how are they to get it, if you make it a penal offence for their leaders to tell them that the present system of government is unnatural, harmful, and a hindrance to progress ? The masses cannot grasp principles unless one illustrates these principles by their application to the affairs of every day life. Your Government and your courts say that an agitation for home rule is legal and permissible, but any criticism that is likely to create dissatisfaction is illegal and deserves to be suppressed high-handedly. You know from experience, sir, that the masses require to be led. No government is willing to make changes unless compelled from below. That is as true of democratic America as of monarchical England. Much more must it be so in the case of countries under foreign yoke. To carry the people with them, the leaders must expose the existing evils and stress the necessity and urgency of sweeping changes in political conditions. The moment they proceed to do so with any degree of effectiveness, they are charged with an attempt to create disaffection and convicted of sedition. Do you honestly believe that any people on the face of the earth can make any progress in political education when they are ruled by a Press Act which stops criticism and discussion in the following terms :

SECTION OF THE INDIAN PRESS ACT OF 1910

"Whenever it appears to the Local Government that any printing press in respect of which any security has been deposited as required by Section 3 is used for the purpose of printing or publishing any newspaper. book, or other document containing any words, signs or visible representations which are likely to have a tendency, directly, or indirectly, whether by inference, suggestion, allusion, metaphor, implication or otherwise :

(a) To incite to murder or to any offence under the Explosives Substances Act of 1908, or to any act of violence or

(b) To seduce any officer, soldier, or sailor in the Army or Navy of His Majesty from his allegiance or his duty or

(c) To bring into hatred or contempt His Majesty or the Government established by the law in British India, or the administration of Justice in British India or any native Prince or Chief under the suzeranity of His Majesty or any class or section of His Majesty's subjects in British India or to excite disaffection towards His Majesty or the said Government or any such Prince or Chief or

(d) To put any person in fear or to cause any annoyance to him and thereby induce him to deliver to any person any property or valuable security, or to do any act which he is not legally bound to do or to omit any act which he is legally entitled to do or

(e) To encourage or incite any person to interfere with the administration of the law or with the maintenance of law and order or

(f) To convey any threat of injury to a public servant, or to any person in whom the public servant is believed to be interested, with a view to inducing that person to do any act or to forbear to do any act connected with the exercise of his public functions the Local Government may, by notice in writing to the keeper of such printing press, stating or describing the words, signs or visible representations which in its opinion are of the nature described above, declare the security deposited in respect of such press and all copies of such newspaper, book, or other document wherever found to be forfeited to His Majesty.

Explanation I —In clause (c) the expression disaffection includes disloyalty and all feelings of enmity.

Explanation II --Comments expressing the disapproval of the measures of the Government of any such native Prince or Chief as aforesaid with a view to obtain their alteration by lawful means or of the administration or other action of the Government or any such native Prince or Chief or of the administration of Justice in British India without exciting or attempting to excite hatred, contempt, or disaffection, do not come under the scope of clause (c)."

Can any people make headway in the art of self-government who are governed by a foreign bureaucracy aided by an army of Indian Czars regulating the very minutest details of their life ? You know that this over-government of India is a direct result of

your rule. Before you came the Indian village was a self-government unit. (See statements of Monroe, Elphinstone, Metcalfe, and Lawrence). Even now the people in the Native States are in this respect better off than the people of British India. The Education Minister of your Cabinet, Mr. H. A. L. Fisher has, after a visit to India, placed it on record that "the inhabitants of a well governed Native State are, on the whole, happier and more contented than the inhabitants of British India. They are more lightly taxed ; the pace of the administration is less urgent and exacting. They feel that they do things for themselves instead of having everything done by a cold and alien benevolence." Yet if an Indian leader were to point this out and ask the Indian masses to improve their lot by demanding and winning for themselves the right to manage their own affairs, and by driving out those influences that stand in their way, he would be persecuted and imprisoned or transported.

The first axiom for political progress is that the people should throw away their attitude of submission to oppression, tyranny, high-handedness, and conditions of slavery whether imposed by a national or a foreign Government. They have a right to revolt if they have the means to do so successfully. But in any case, they have a right to discuss, agitate and organize for changes. This they cannot do unless they have a free press, a free platform, and the right of free association. In India the first is denied by the Press Act, the second by the comprehensive sections of the Penal Code, and the third by the so-called "Seditious Meetings Act." What little was left has been done away with under the extensive powers taken and exercised by the executive under the plea of war exigency by the "Defence of India Act." While every other part of the Empire, including the "Mother Country" is discussing political and economic changes of an extremely radical character, such as the establishment of a more effective Imperial Parliament and Preferential Tariffs after the War, not to speak of constructive programmes for education, and industrial rejuvenation, the Indian leaders are "officially" advised to be mum, and any effort to rouse the country to a consciousness of its rights and duties is characterized as perverted, ill-timed, and inconsistent with loyalty.

The advocates of "Home Rule" are being openly hampered in their propaganda. Papers advocating Home Rule have been

persecuted, and leaders have been prohibited from entering provincial areas. But what is worse is that the Criminal Investigation Department have been instructed to take down the names of all those who have enlisted in the cause, either as active or passive workers. A deputation of representatives of the press that waited on the Viceroy to lay their grievances before him has been lectured on the impropriety of thus raising the question at this juncture and has otherwise been treated with shocking discourtesy.

In conclusion, let me ask you, sir, to notice the coercive methods by which the War Loan is being raised in India. Poor underpaid subordinate officials are being forced to purchase Government stock. They will surely purchase the stock and win the goodwill of their officers, but just as surely they will squeeze the cost out of the people. That will be strictly in accord with the standards of loyalty set up by your officials !

Mr. David Llyod George, I have addressed this letter to you, because at this moment you seem to be the only British statesman possessed of imagination. Exercise your imagination, sir, a little and save India for the Empire ; win the gratitude and blessings of a fifth of the human race—of a people who were one of the first pioneers of civilization in the world, who laid the foundations of culture, which you profess to be so very anxious to save. Remember that the Indians were rich, prosperous, free, self-governing, civilized and great, both in peace and war, when not only Britain but even "Greece and Rome were nursing the tenants of the wilderness." The Indians have lost their freedom because they oppressed the people under them and as surely as night follows day, the British will lose all that makes them great today, if they continue to oppress and exploit the subject races within their Empire. The world cannot be safe for democracy unless India is self-governed. Nor can there be any lasting peace in the world, so long as India and China are not strong enough to protect themselves.

Pardon me, sir, if I have disturbed you at such a critical moment ; though it is folly to presume that you could be disturbed in the slightest degree by such a letter. I have written it out of a sense of duty as sacred as that which inspires you in your herculean task ; and if you are inclined to think harshly of me for this letter, just try to put yourself in my position and decide what then would be your point of view.

28. AN OPEN LETTER TO EDWIN MONTAGU

PERMIT ME to congratulate you most heartily on your appointment to the high office you now hold[1] which makes you virtually the Supreme ruler of the teeming millions of India. Secretary of State for India, under the law as it stands, wields in both theory and practice, greater powers, over a greater area, covering a larger population, than the Grand Moghul of India ever did, even in his halcyon days, or than any other single monarch or ruler does in these days except the President of the United States or the President of China. India has been aptly said to be the "brightest" and I may add, the biggest jewel in the Crown of Great Britain and Ireland. It is in fact the only possession, which constitutes the British Empire, as the rest of the Empire, excluding the self-governing Dominions, has either arisen out of it or is held for the purpose of safeguarding British supremacy there It is the only part of the Empire which pays and has in the past paid well. It is the only part, outside Great Britain itself, which has a history and a past, great and glorious—whose people were once not only free and rich, but highly civilized, the originators and founders of a civilization which still shines with a splendour and richness of its own. Any one may consequently be proud of holding the Office, to which you, sir, have recently been appointed by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. There is hardly any other office in the British Empire which can compare favourably, either in possibilities or in potentialities, in the extent of the power which it confers on its holder or in its importance in relation to the rest of the Empire, with the one you are filling at the present moment. There is no other office, the holder of which exercises his power without any responsibility to the people whose destiny, for good or for evil, he controls. Even the Prime Minister is subjected to a

This Open Letter addressed to Edwin Samuel Montagu, Secretary of State for India is dated New York, 15 September 1917.

greater amount of direct criticism than falls to the lot of the Secretary of State for India. The only occasion on which the Secretary of State for India feels the burden of his office arises when some untoward event happens which directly affects the British elector, or touches British lives and British prestige abroad.

Such an occasion was furnished in this War by the Mesopotamia incident. The fall of Kut[2], the loss of prestige caused thereby, the importance of the disaster in the present emergency, the loss of valuable lives which it is said could be prevented by more prudent management of the campaign, have moved the British public in such manner as few other incidents in connection with the administration of India, have done since the Mutiny of 1857, if at all. If my memory does not deceive me this is perhaps the only occasion in the history of British rule in India, at least after the Crown assumed the direct management of Indian affairs, when British public opinion asserted itself so strongly and so effectively as to force the Secretary of State for India to resign his office[3]. But the history of the British administration of India is full of incidents which resulted in greater losses of human lives in India and outside than on this occasion, but these lives were mostly those of the natives and they apparently did not matter much. The millions who died by preventable famines, by inefficient and inadequate handling of the bubonic plague, the millions who die by preventable unsanitary conditions and by diseases brought about by insufficient feeding and horrible housing, have never seemingly moved the British public so deeply and intensely as the Mesopotamia affair has done.

From the Indian point of view it is something to have had a Mesopotamia disaster. It has opened the eyes of the British public to the real nature of what is the Government of India. Even the Jingoes have discovered that it is wrong to entrust such vast powers to one or two men. A writer in the *Evening News* (11th July) is forced to admit that "to all intents and purposes, India, with its population of 300,000,000, and its vast area and resources, is under the autocratic rule of two men—the Secretary of State and the Viceroy. It is true that both of these high personages have Councils to assist them, but in all matters affecting the internal and most of the external affairs of India, their word goes, and is unchallenged and uncriticised. They can make and unmake, cut down or expand. issue inexorable decrees which may alter the lives of millions of the

King's subjects, and, in fact, play with this great Empire almost as they will." So far the Imperialist had insisted on trusting the "man on spot." It was repeated *ad nauseam*, in season and out of season, that the Indian Services, Civil and Military, were the acme of perfection and that they should be absolutely trusted in Indian affairs. Any criticism by Members of Parliament was considered officious and impertinent. The few members who called the attention of the British public to the condition of affairs in India and to the grievances of the natives, were called names and branded as "little Englanders," "mischief makers," "meddlers" and so on. After over a century of misrule, it has been discovered that it was wrong to leave the actual Rulers of India so little controlled by Parliament or public opinion as they have been. Adds the writer in the *Evening news* :

"What really influential voice has this country or Parliament in the Government of India ? The Secretary of State, although nominally responsible to the Prime Minister, is really uncontrolled. Old, encrusted custom has resulted in the practical abolition of supervision, either by the Premier personally or by the Cabinet. It is true that the Secretary of State may consult his colleagues, but none of them would dispute any of his findings or those of the Viceroy—the man on the spot.

"And the Indian debates in the House of Commons have always been perfunctory and 'uninteresting.' The great majority of the members did not listen or take part in them ; India was so far away, and besides, they knew nothing of the complex machinery which was used in its administration. So all comment on Ministers' statements was left to the small body of "Indian" members, who had a few questions to ask as to military or commercial matters in which they might be personally concerned.

"The India Office has stood aloof and somewhat mysterious to the ordinary run of Englishmen. Very little is known outside as to the composition of its Council or the manner in which it is elected. As a matter of fact the Council consists of a dozen members, mostly Anglo-Indian officials, one military member, and two members of the Indian community. It meets weekly or fortnightly, and takes the advice of the permanent officials on most matters.

"Permanent officials have not been a great success in the English Civil Service, and the India Office provides no exception.

These men, autocrats in their own spheres, have an admirable knowledge and experience of routine, and faithfully adhere to the system of their predecessors, but the two most essential qualities in a successful head of a department, commonsense and imagination, are not conspicuous in their efforts. And it must be remembered in this connection that the Secretary of State and his Council take their action largely on the advice of the permanent officials.

"In India the Viceroy can over-rule a decision of his Council, and is, in fact, an absolute monarch ; a despot, though a benevolent one."

Later on the writer draws the following picture of the Indian officials:

"When he (Lord Curzon) was in India, Lord Kitchner, always intolerant of superior authority, objected to the military member of the Viceroy's Council being an officer junior (sic) to him. He had his way but the result is that, under the present arrangement, the Commander-in-Chief is the one who directs the Viceroy's military policy, and no independent voice can be raised against him.

"It is easy to imagine what a breeding ground for sycophancy and intrigue is afforded by such a system, outside the control of public or parliament, and in which full power is in the hands of one or two men. We have seen something during this War of the way in which women can bring influence to bear in high military quarters at home. But in the Indian services the amount of intrigue is appalling.

"Those who know anything about the way appointments are made, both in Civil Service and the Army of India, were not surprised at the failures disclosed in the Mesopotamia report, although they were staggered at the amount of incompetence and misjudgment attained. Mesopotamia is not the only field where high Indian officials blundered.

"In too few cases are efficiency and merit the stepping stones to promotion and influential position. Seniority, although it carries along with it stupidity, and favour gain the 'plums.' Many civil servants and Army officers in India, burning with desire to leave things better than they found them, have been snubbed for their zeal, and 'black listed' by the mandarins owing to the evidence of ability and ideas they possessed......"

I have given this lengthy quotation in support of my statement as to the unique nature of the position held by the Secretary of State for India and the Indian Services under him. It is, thus, the greatest and most responsible office under the Crown, sir, to which you have been raised, on a historic occasion like this. Your appointment has met with a mixed reception. The Liberals of England are satisfied, the Natives of India are pleased, the Tories are shocked and the Anglo-Indian Jingoes terrified. The very fact that the Tories have been shocked by your appointment and the Anglo-Indian Jingoes terrified ; the reasons adduced by them in their chorus of disapproval and dissatisfaction (one of them, Lord Beresford, had the meanness to say that you were disqualified for the post because you were not fully of British blood)[1] are *a fortiori*, good grounds for the exultation of the Indians over your appointment. But they have something more than this to rely upon. Your work as Under Secretary of State for India under Lord Morley, and your subsequent, particularly more recent, utterances relating to India have filled them with hope. They feel as if they have found a Messiah in you. It is here that I have my misgivings. While I can join with them in sincerely congratulating you on your well deserved elevation, my studies of the English political system and past experience of English dealings with India, give me no reason to be over-optimistic about your ability to effect such radical changes in the system of administration in India as alone will satisfy the most moderate of Indian nationalists. However, your selection was perhaps the best that could be made by the Premier and for that we may well be grateful to him.

What however, damps our spirit and mars enthusiasm is the sad disillusionment we have had in the past, particularly in the case of Lord Morley. In 1906 when the late Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman came to power, the Indian political organizations throughout India cabled their congratulations to him, at the same time praying that John Morley be appointed Secretary of State for India. As fate would have it, one of these cablegrams was drafted by me on behalf of the Indian Association of Lahore. When our request was actually granted and the appointment of Mr. John Morley as Secretary of State for India was announced, all India rejoiced and felt as if their moment of delivery had come. But to their sorrow and disappointment John Morley was not in office for twelve months before they

found out that even he could not do anything worth doing. They had hoped that he would undo the mischief done by Lord Curzon in the partition of Bengal, that he would give them some kind of self-government, that he would make education free and compulsory and that he would lay the foundations of an Industrial India ; but before long they discovered that the bureaucracy in India and the Jingoes in England succeeded in spreading their spell over the soul of John Morley. John Morley not only refused to undo the partition of Bengal but went several steps further in discarding the great principles of his life as regards the sacredness of human liberties. He sanctioned deportations without trial and inaugurated a general regime of coercion and repression. The writer of this letter, one of those who had prayed for his appointment, was the first victim of John Morley's changed soul. The disillusionment that followed was terrible and gave birth to the Indian Revolutionary party, which has now become a permanent feature of Indian life. We do not know what were the inner influences that brought about the change in Morley ; nor whether his convictions were reversed or whether he found his environment too strong for him. The fact remains that when in actual office, John Morley failed to act up to his principles and that it was the constant worry of being reminded of this fact by his colleagues of the ministerial benches in the House of Commons which reconciled him to let "honest John" be metamorphosed into Viscount Morley. The birth of the noble Viscount was the death of the great Commoner. What I am afraid of is, that the same fate might be awaiting you in the near future. Those who know what a great personality John Morley was in British politics in 1906, find it rather difficult to believe, much against their wishes, that you would succeed where John Morley had failed.

Yes it is because of that hope that the Indians of all classes and shades of opinion have hailed your appointment as the head of the Government of India with joy, with hope and with enthusiasm.

Much water has flowed down the Indus since Lord Morley retired from the office of the Secretary of State for India. Events have happened on the Thames, the Danube, the Elbe, the Rhine, the Volga, the Tigris and the Nile, that foretell momentous changes in the world. After this bloody war in which millions have died and millions have been maimed for life, which has devastated the whole of Europe and laid waste large tracts of Asia and Africa, which has

brought to dust the proudest heads and the sharpest intellects of Europe, it is inconceivable that the world will revert to pre-war conditions of life.

India of 1917 is also quite different from India of 1907. Hindus and Mohammedans have sunk their differences and are making a united stand in their demand for political liberties. The Anglo-Indian plans of creating an Indian Ulster have miscarried and never before durning the British domination was India so united in its political and economic ideals as today. In 1907, we were yet babies "crying for the moon." We had not yet grasped the fundamentals of the situation. Our horizon was clouded by sectarian boundaries and we were fighting for crumbs. In 1917 we are a united people no longer praying for concessions, but demanding rights. Our earnestness has stood the tests which are usually applied in such cases. The records of criminal courts, the prisons in India and outside, the large list of patriots who have willingly given away their lives for the cause of freedom, the battlefields of France, Flanders and Mesopotamia, the international centres of the world are all evidences of our determination to win our rights, be the cost what it may. Yes, all this is true but it is equally true that while the world has advanced and is advancing, has changed and is changing ; while India of today is so radically different from India of 1907, the Curzons and Sydenhams of British politics are, as regards India, still standing where they were ten years ago. Who knows but that in spite of a clear brain and a willing heart, you also may eventually succumb to sinister influences ? It may be that these apprehensions are unfounded and that your appointment as Secretary of State for India is an earnest of the united mind of the Cabinet about the future Government of India, and that Mr. David Lloyd George has after all persuaded his colleagues to take a broad view oi things and save India for the Empire, by conceding to her what is after all her due. This is, however, in the womb of future. In the meantime we may well consider what the situation demands. I propose to examine the situation from the point of view of the Moderates.

II

Let us first see what the fundamental grievances of India are. Our first grievance is that the Government of India is an absentee landlordism, in no way responsible to the people of India, the latter having no voice in its constitution or in its renewal. Our second

grievance is that the Government of India is principally carried on in the interest of the British capitalists and that British interests take precedence in the determination of Indian fiscal policy. The fact that India is governed by a bureaucracy foreign in race, religion and nationality, that the Indians are treated as helots, unworthy of carrying arms and keeping and manufacturing them, that they are denied the benefits of free education, free speech and free press, and that they die in millions from famine and epidemics and unsanitary conditions, for want of adequate measures to protect them from the causes thereof, all follow from the two fundamental causes mentioned above.

Great Britain and her allies in the War have been objecting to Prussian autocracy, Prussian bureaucracy, Prussian militarism and Prussian junkerism. Yet in India all these monstrosities exist in an extraordinary degree and every effort to dethrone them is vehemently opposed by persons who want the world to believe that they are fighting to establish democracy and to enforce the principles of democratic governments all the world over. What the Indians are asking for, is nothing but the application of these principles to the government of India and it is obvious that no reform could be satisfactory which is not in accord with these principles. It may be, that the vested interests of the Empire do not permit of a bold and decisive step being taken at once in democratising the personnel of the Government of India, but surely no reform of the Indian Administration can be even a step towards the goal which does not secure fiscal autonomy to the people of India. India cannot and ought not, in the words of Mr. Austen Chamberlain, to continue to be the hewer of wood and the drawer of water for the rest of the Empire, as she has been in the past.

The Mesopotamia disaster, has brought to light the fundamental weakness of the Government of India—its irresponsibility. What is the Government of India ? The civil and military servants recruited in England constitute the Government of India. They govern India in the name of the British people. They make no secret of the fact that they are in no way responsible to the people of India. But are they responsible to the British nation ? In theory, yes. In practice, no. The British nation and their representatives in Parliament exercise no control over the Government of India,

have neither the wish nor the time to do so. The Services are self-contained and self-controlled. They have in the course of the last sixty years evolved an ethical code of their own, which brooks no interference or control from without—which lays down the standards by which everything relating to the functions of Government in India is judged. The first test of everything is, how does it affect the Services—their status, their salaries, their prospects, last but not least their prestige. Nothing which cannot pass through these crucibles can be good for India or for the Empire. The civil and military servants that rule India are so many gods, with their goddesses by their sides, who form an oligarchy whose interests and comforts and prestige dominate all the activities of Government in India. They are there to safeguard and protect the interests of the Empire—*viz.*, those of the British capitalist and the British manufacturer. The Government of India is a kind of closely organized trade guild or trade union, in which the non-unionist has no chance and the like of which the world has not known before. The difference between an ordinary Indian and an Indian Civil Service man may best be judged by the difference between their economic positions. The lowest salary of an Indian Civil Servant is Rs.450 a month to which substantial additions are allowable in the shape of allowances, *etc.* The lowest salary of an Indian Government employee is Rs. 7 a month. So an ordinary Indian is worth only 7/450 as compared with an Englishman in the lowest grades of the Indian Civil Service. The human needs of the two, their personal and family needs ought to be the same but even making allowances for the special needs of a ruler imported from a foreign climate, the difference between their economic positions is a standardising of human degradation sanctioned by "Democratic" England. Once you accept these standards as valid and legitimate, the rest follows as a matter of course. In my humble judgment the crux of the situation lies here. Are the rank and file of Indians human beings ? Are the rank and file of the Anglo-Indians in India, or even the highest of them, gods to be worshipped by the former ? Are they entitled to treat the former as if they existed for their use or for the use of their masters, the British capitalists ? Has India any rights of her own or is she merely the drudge of the Empire ? Must she continue to be the mere hewer of wood and the drawer of water for the rest of the Empire ? What is the position of the Govermennt in India ? Are they rulers imposed from without by force or are

they servants, delegated to perform the functions of Government by the free choice and consent of the people ? Does the Government exist for the people or the reverse of it ? Must India be governed from the outside or is she to govern herself ? Is she to continue to be the milch cow of the Empire, a mere possession to be exploited by the masters, or is she to occupy a position of equality and be an equal among equals ? If the British statesmen honestly mean to confer a position of equality on India then they must cease to talk of India in the language of patronage. The question then is not, how far and how many Indians can be admitted into the Government of their country, but how far it is necessary, in the interests of India, to employ Britishers of non-Indian origin. The question is not how England should govern India, but how India should govern herself.

Let there be no misunderstanding on this point, Mr. Montagu. Moderate India is prepared to share the burdens of the Empire in proportion to the benefits she receives from the Empire, in a spirit of family cooperation, but no more. What we stand for, are our rights and liberties and not a few posts in the Services or a few seats in the Councils. We ask for no favours. We demand our rights.

The British element in the Indian Administration must disappear ; whether it disappears now or in ten years or even in twenty is not material. Any scheme that ignores this point of view is doomed to failure. The extremists are for absolute independence because they do not believe that the British will ever concede that point. The moment that point is conceded in genuine honesty of purpose, the cult of extremism will lose the vast bulk of its adherents.

We are a part of the British Empire ; we have largely contributed to make the Empire as it is today. But so far, we have shed our blood, given our substance in wealth and labour in making the Empire for the benefit of others. Henceforth we shall like to reap the benefits thereof, shouldering the burdens in proportion to our means. Henceforth the test to be applied in deciding all questions relating to the constitution of the Government of India should be how far a contemplated scheme accords with that principle. All such questions must in future be submitted to the judgment of the Indians. No decision should be imposed on them in the arriving at which they have had no direct share.

Let us apply this test to the different schemes put forward for the future Government of India and then decide, in mutual consultation, which of them is likely to satisfy the Indians. So far we have three schemes before us :

(a) The one formulated by the Joint Committee of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, which is substantially the same as was submitted by the elected members of the Supreme Legislative Council of India.[5]

(b) Mr. Gokhale's scheme recently made public in the columns of the *Times*.[6]

(c) Lord Islington's scheme, outlined by him in a speech at Oxford, on August 8, 1917[7].

In weighing Mr. Gokhale's scheme, it should be remembered that it was drawn up (a) when he was very ill ; (b) in the early days of the War, long before the developments of 1915, 1916 and 1917 had taken place. The world has since then advanced much further than could have been imagined by Mr. Gokhale. The scheme bears upon it the stamp of over-cautiousness and is more a kind of halting compromise than a record of his wishes. I yield to none in my respect for Mr. Gokhale. I do not think Indian public life, during British rule, has produced a man of greater depth of patriotism, more sincere love of country and finer sentiments, honour and self-respect than he. His disinterestedness and incorruptibility were above suspicion. In his conceptions of possibilities, however, he was rather timid and over-cautious. He was afraid of being called a dreamer. The charge which he dreaded most was that of a visionary. Hence his mind always halted in making even just demands. He was rather a poor negotiator.*

*Since the above was in type, we have read the following paragraph which appeared in *India*, London, of August 31, 1917 :

"A Bombay telegram of August 22, brings particulars of an important statement on the subject of Mr. Gokhale's political testament which has been made by Mr. V.S. Srinivasa Sastri, member of the Imperial Legislative Council, and successor of Mr. Gokhale as senior member of the Servants of India Society. The memorandum, says Mr. Sastari, was only a rough draft prepared with a view to consultation with Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and the

Continued on p. 292.

But what makes his scheme impracticable and unacceptable is that it lacks in all safeguards against future economic exploitation of India by the rest of the British Empire. No scheme can be acceptable to India which does not protect us from that. India is poor, has grown poorer under British rule. But what is most deplorable is that its masses are the most illiterate and suffering lot on the face of the earth. No scheme of Government can be accepted which does not make sufficient provision under proper guarantees for the uplift of the Indian masses, both educationally and economically. In fact these two go together. The Indian ryot and the Indian working man must be lifted up from the lowest depths of the economic slough in which they at present are. That is not possible unless India gets fiscal autonomy. Mr. Gokhale seems to provide for it by suggesting that "in financial matters the Governmet of India," constituted as proposed by him, "should be freed from the control of the Secretary of State." Unhappily, however, he ignores that under his scheme the Government of India shall always have a standing majority of non-Indians, on both the Executive and the Legislative side. So long as the final taxing power is in the hands of non-Indians, it is futile to expect that the financial interests of India can be sufficiently protected. It does no good to ignore human nature. The Britishers in India, official or non-official, cannot be expected to put the interests of India and of the Indian masses above those of Great Britain and the Empire. All the misfortunes of India in the past have proceeded from that assumption. Individual Britishers have here and there risen above that human weakness styled the love of one's own country and one's own people, but generally they have failed. To formulate any scheme for the future Government of India which is based on the above assumption and which does not secure economic independence to India is to give the shadow while denying the substance.

Aga Khan. It does not represent Mr. Gokhale's final conclusions, or what, in his opinion, the people of India were fit for; but only what might, if spontaneously announced by the Government, avert agitation during the War and assure the fullest cooperation of the people of India. Mr. Sastri expresses the belief that, if Mr. Gokhale were alive today, he would voice the most progressive and enlightened phase of public thought compatible with the safety of the Empire and with ordered progress in India."

Mr. Gokhale's scheme does not make adequate provision for this. He seems to have thought that making the Government of India independent of the Secretary of State's control "in financial matters" insures that. It would, if the Government of India were made responsible to a Legislative Council, having a majority of elected Indian members. But not otherwise. An official majority in the Viceroy's Council is in practice a negation of India's right to lay down its own fiscal policy.

Lord Islington's scheme, which everybody who has any political sense can understand, probably lays down the general lines on which the British statesmen in the Cabinet are thinking, adopts the "harmless" provisions of Mr. Gokhale's scheme, but rejects the only safeguard that he provides against the future economic exploitation of India. Lord Islington tells us that the Secretary of State's Council cannot be abolished nor will the Secretary of State's control and veto be done away with. In the light of past experience, let us see what this means. Suppose the Legislative Council of India passes a financial measure which, though obviously beneficial to India, like the cotton duties, is supposed to be harmful to British commercial interests, what will the Secretary of State for India, who is always a party man, do? In nine cases out of ten he will do what Lord Salisbury did in 1876, *i.e.*, overrule and veto the measure passed by the Legislative Council of India ; perhaps he will nip the idea in the bud and will not allow or sanction legislation at all. In 1876 Lord Salisbury disapproved of the tariff on cotton goods imposed by Lord Northbrook, with the concurrence of the majority of his Council[8]. When informed of it, Lord Salisbury, as Secretary of State, not only objected to the legislation, but also expressed his resentment at the Government of India having undertaken the legislation without his sanction. Lord Northbrook resigned, and since then the Government of India has been the willing slave of the Secretary of State.

This state of things is bound to continue if the Secretary of State's veto is retained and also if the Viceroy's Council is so constituted as to give a majority veto to officials. Now this must not be. The Indian Legislature, having a majority of non-official Indians, must have the supreme power of saying what taxes they will raise and how they will spend them. The most that can be conceded in the matter is that India's contribution towards Imperial purposes

may be fixed by Parliament and any reduction of that may be put outside the jurisdiction of the Indian Legislature.

A retrospective review of the Government of India's military policy would show that India has so far been spending a greater proportion of her revenues on the Army, than has ever been done by any other part of the Empire. Mr. Yusaf Ali, late of the I.C.S., quoted the figures in the *Nineteenth Century* for February, 1917.

Military Budgets of the British Empire for 1913-14

	Millions of pounds	Percentage of Total Budget of Revenue
Great Britain	28.2	14.5
India	18.	22.
Australia	2.5	10.
Canada	1.5	5.
South Africa	1.15	7.7

Yet we observe that the Mesopotamia Commission[9] has ruthlessly criticised the conduct of the Indian Finance Minister who is said to have refused to sanction greater outlay on the army in India at a time when no war was in sight.

In India money has been spent like water on frontier defences, frontier wars, and frontier railways. Outside India, we have paid for wars which were waged in British interests and for Imperial purposes. A reference to the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure in 1896, will show how India in the past was saddled with the expenses of foreign wars. Now we do not object to sharing the burdens of the Empire in proportion to our means and in proportion to the benefits we get for our connection with the Empire, but we strongly object to being bled in the interest of the other parts of the Empire. The extent to which revenues raised from the starving ryots have hitherto been spent on the Army, has resulted in starving those departments of civil life without which civil progress of any kind is impossible, for example, education, sanitation and industries. This state of things cannot continue. The future organization of the Army should be placed on such lines as to secure the greatest amount of protection at the least expense. A national militia may be organized by which a large number of trained Indians may be kept in reserve without being paid full salaries. The number of British soldiers may be

reduced. An Indian Navy manned by Indians may be organised and the cost charged to Indian revenues. Anyway, India's contributions to the military strength of the Empire may be fixed by Parliament and thus placed outside the power of the Indian Legislature. The quota thus fixed should be furnished by both British India and the Native States. The Native States ought to bear their proportional share of the burden. I am confident that the moment military careers are opened to the Indians on terms of honour and self-respect a large number of Indian volunteers would be forthcoming for the defence of the country and for the maintenance of internal order.

So far, India has been the "goat" of the Empire. In future she refuses to be so. The heads of Federal revenues mentioned by Lord Islington—customs, post-office, railways, telegraphs, forests, salt, mint, tributes, are such as to make it impossible for any improper discriminations to be made by the Indians among themselves, so no fear need be entertained on that score. The memorandum left by Mr. Gokhale was his personal opinion prepared at a time when his health was failing. He never discussed the matter with his friends and colleagues. His opinions do not in any way bind the rest of India and any attempt to take shelter behind the authority of his great name in denying substantial fiscal autonomy to India will be deeply resented. Young India cannot be bound by the opinion of one man, however illustrious that man may have been.*

Taking the other items of the two schemes, both Mr. Gokhale and Lord Islington, seem to be agreed that the Governors should be appointed from England. So far good, but we fail to see why Governorships cannot be thrown open to Indians. Indians are administering Native States. Why cannot they govern British provinces? Why must the Governors be always Englishmen? Do you really think sir, that men like Lord Pentland, Sir Michael O' Dwyer, Lord Sydenham, Sir James La Touche, Sir Charles Rivaz, Sir Louis Dane, are such superior beings that no Indians of that

*That Nationalist India is taking this view of Mr. Gokhale's scheme is apparent from Reuter's telegrams to the *Times* Two Mohammedan gentlemen resident in England have said the same thing in a signed letter to the *Manchester Guardian.*

calibre could be found in the length and breadth of India? Let our past history and the records of Native States answer this question.

As to the Executive Councils of the provinces, Mr. Gokhale's memorandum fixes the number at six, Lord Islington proposes only four. Mr. Gokhale's memorandum is silent as to the method of selection of Indian members, while Lord Islington says that election in their case is out of the question. Lord Islington is discreetly silent about the strength and composition of the Provincial Legislative Councils, while Mr. Gokhale's memorandum makes definite recommendations on these points, and adds that on the Provincial Legislative Councils "there should be no nominated non-official members except as experts." He fixes the proportion of elected non-official members at four-fifths. But the fact that he makes the tenure of office of the members of the Provincial Councils independent of the Legislative Councils reduces considerably the value of his scheme as a measure of self-government.

Coming to the other points, we find that both Mr. Gokhale and Lord Islington have said nothing about the future recruitment of the Services. There are many people who know what Mr. Gokhale's opinions in the matter were. Mr. Justice Abdul Rahim has expressed them in his minute of dissent[10]. Even in his memorandum Gokhale has said that in provinces the Services should be "provincial". Now the term "provincial" has come to possess a technical meaning and if Mr. Gokhale has used it in that sense then it means that he did not want the provincial services to be manned by the I.C.S. men. If so, the I.C.S. men would, under his scheme, be employed only in the departments under the Government of India and their number would necessarily be limited. The recommendations of the Royal Commission[11] in the matter of the future recruitment of the service have been so widely and thoroughly criticised in India and in England that I need not say anything on that score.

But it should be distinctly understood that no reform of the Indian Administration would be fruitful unless the bureaucratic character of the Services is changed. There is a great deal of sense in the following observations of the writer in the *Evening News*, London :

"The whole system has been described as 'rotten to the core'. Without going so far as that, it may be said that Parliament should

exercise more control over Indian affairs, that the appointments to the Councils should be open to criticism, that a systematic clearance of all incompetents should be made in both civil and military services, and a chance given to broad-minded, intelligent men who can be found to serve India. 'Permanent' is a word that should be wiped out of existence in the matter of officialdom, and a man should be retained in his office only by reason of his fitness for and his success in it.

"It is good news to hear that Mr. Austen Chamberlain is developing a scheme to give India more control over her affairs, but he will meet with failure at the outset if he allows the ordinary type of Indian official too much voice in his new system. If he is able to get the farmers, and the business men, as well as the ruling classes, to take an intelligent and helpful share in the management of the Empire, there will be no more 'Mespots' and India will be able to look forward with some hope to that progress which is now suffocated by apathy and red-tapeism."

What is needed is that for ordinary purposes the Services be recruited by competitive examinations held in India. But all appointments requiring expert knowledge like the heads of the Finance, Engineering, Medical, Education departments, should be made only for a number of years, thus providing for the infusion of new blood with up to date ideas on these subjects. The heads of great departments should not be appointed by seniority, but by selection on merit, such selection including men not in the permanent services. Why should Indian taxes be spent in paying big salaries to men who received their education and succeeded in passing examinations when the world was still backward in scientific development ? Knowledge is advancing with rapid strides. Men who are not up to date in such subjects as sociology, criminology, psychology, social psychology, crowd psychology, psycho-analysis, *etc.*, ought not to be allowed to preside over Courts of Justice or lay down principles of administration. I have known Judges presiding in the highest criminal courts of the country, who were promoted to these offices from lower grades, who had as much knowledge of criminology and psychology as we have about the man in the moon. Men have been appointed to High Court Judgeships who had no judicial training, who had never practised law, simply because their seniority in the service entitled them to promotion. Civil servants have often been

pitch-forked even into departments requiring technical knowledge. All this must cease if India is to receive the value of her money.

The Mesopotamia Commission report shows how men of anti-diluvian views bungled the administration of such departments as the medical and transport, *etc.* What happened in these departments is happening in other departments. The transport and the commissariat services, the public works and the medical departments are corrupt "to the core" because the service codes of honour protect them from exposure. Every Indian knows how native commissariat agents and contractors profit from wars and huge public works with their English colleagues and patrons in the services. Men of no consequence get rich quick. The money does not fall from the skies. It is made possible for them to make huge profits by incompetent and corrupt heads of departments. The contractors and the agents share with the engineer and the transport officer and thus public revenues are squandered. This is by no means peculiar to India. It has happened in the past, even in democratic England, republican France and in the United States. The difference is that in these countries these things are easily detected and cannot be perpetuated. The heads of departments are not appointed from permanent services. They are constantly changed and so are not protected by the traditional caste codes about prestige. All these abuses will disappear if the people of the country through their representatives get a voice in the management of their affairs. It will be to their interest to bring to task all corrupt officials. They will feel personal interest in the public purse. Every penny saved will count. At present they think that the moment a tax is collected it becomes the property of a foreign bureaucracy in which they have no further interest. If the native contractor or the native commissariat agent does not profit, they argue, some European would. Besides, all complaints of corruption and bribery against European officers are systematically discouraged by the authorities. It is felt that the exposure of a European official affects the Government prestige. So the fiction of the purity and the incorruptibility of the Services is maintained. It may be said to the honour of the Indian Civil Service that the vast majority of them are free from financial corruption ; but can the same be said of the army departments, of public works and railways, *etc.*, the great spending departments ?

To sum up, fiscal autonomy must be the cornerstone of any

reform of Indian Administration if it is to satisfy Indian Nationalists. The other cornerstone is the democratised control of the public services. Any scheme which does not provide this will be still-born and will fail.

III

I observe that some British statesmen are making a fetish of the principle that the edifice of self-government should be built from below and that experience in the management of local affairs must be a necessary qualification for shouldering provincial and Imperial responsibilities. Now this is a principle which does not admit of universal application. In fact the verdict of history is at least as much against it as in its favour. We have the case of Japan before us which disproves the universality of the theory. Yet no Indian of any sense opposes the development of local self-government. In fact, obstruction to the development of local self-government, the destruction of indigenous institutions, by which village, town and city governments were conducted in India before British rule, is one of the principal charges which we bring against the present bureaucratic system of centralized government in India. Before the advent of the British, the country was mainly self-governed, except in Imperial matters. The British have destroyed those institutions by taking all the strings of government in their hands. It is now proposed to re-establish the Panchayat system in villages. Anyone who has closely studied village life in India, what it is now under the British, and what it was in pre-British days, will unhesitatingly say that it is almost impossible to revive the village Panchayats (Councils). The conditions of life which had originally brought the Panchayats into existence and which made them the efficient instruments of administration in pre-British days have ceased to exist. The old Panchayats were the outcome of the old conditions of life. The villages were mostly self-contained, with not much communication with the outside world. The Panchayats generally ruled by moral forces, which have been immensely weakened, if not destroyed now. Village communities are no longer the compact, closely related, inter-dependent bodies which they once were. Under the old system the communal ties were so strong as to make it impossible for anyone to disobey or disregard the communal decisions. Freedom of movement into and from communities was restricted within the castes,all the reins of power were in the hands of caste councils.

All inter-caste affairs were managed by caste organizations; all community interests looked after by the village councils. The village Panchayats had the power of taxation, which brought them sufficient revenue for communal purposes; they provided for education, sanitation, watch and justice. The villages did not pay any taxes for these purposes except to the Panchayats. All this has now been changed. The district authorities realize the road cess, the school cess, the Chaukidara and all other local cesses. In former days there was a small tax paid by all professions and trades not connected with land. This revenue was used for common purposes. Thus the old village councils had power and responsibilities. All this is now changed. The village industries have been ruined, never to be revived again. The days of cottage industries are gone, most probably for ever. The lands in villages are freely bought and sold, subject only to precarious law of pre-emption, which is doomed to disappear sooner or later. The village servants are no longer subordinate to the village community. It will be a calamity if education is localized and isolated in the sense it was in olden times. The administration of justice cannot be placed in old conditions. With the changed conditions of life, with greater freedom of movement, extended connection with and dependence on outside life, it is impossible to restore the village councils to their old position. All that can be done is to have small village councils that will look after the village sanitation and represent the village in its relations with outside life.

Mr. Gokhale proposed to assign them a part of the Excise revenue for village needs. It is difficult to say what exactly Mr. Gokhale meant by this suggestion. The moral and material interests of the community require that the sale of liquor and intoxicating drugs should be so restricted and controlled as to reduce the amount of revenue realized therefrom to a minimum. The present policy of raising a big revenue by the lease of licences for the sale of liquor is extremely harmful as it naturally tends to increase the facilities for the sale of liquor and drugs. What other sources of income the village councils can have, has not been pointed out. Local self-government in villages and Talukas, cannot be made a reality unless the land laws are so changed as to reduce the burden of the ryot, restrict the share of the landlord and reduce the Government demand to such an extent as to leave a decent margin to the ryot for a life

of comfort. The greatest problem for the Indian administrator is how to raise the income of the ryot and the labourer and give him more to spend on himself and his family. This is not possible unless the land tax is reduced. Any reduction in the land tax is impossible unless the foreign agency which rules India is done away with. At present the average income per capita in India is two pounds ; the average taxation, seven shillings. The problem before the country is to raise the income per head of population, increase the revenues for public improvement and education, and reduce the incidence of taxation.

It thus will be seen that in the case of India, the theory that you must build self-government from below is untenable. This is a case where reform must come from above. The Government of India must be democratised in order to tackle the question of revenues and the cost of Administration. They will show the ways and means to local bodies and make it possible for them to inaugurate effective self-government. With the Government of India or the Provincial Government squeezing everything possible from the people in the shape of taxes and spending it on the Army and on a foreign administrative agency and in paying the interest on foreign investments, nothing is left for local bodies to do. The latter cannot extract any blood from where there is none. With a tax of 7½ per cent. *ad valorem* on Justice (which reaches the figure of 22½ per cent. by the time the case is decided by the final Court of Appeal and Revision), with the revenues from the local cesses going into the Federal and Provincial treasuries in one form or another, hardly any sources of revenue are left for the local bodies. What we demand is that sufficient power be conceded to local bodies (district, town and village), to make local self-government effective. This cannot be done unless the constitution of the Federal and Provincial Governments is so far democratised as to make it possible for the representatives of the people to lay down a fiscal policy which will enable them to shoulder the Imperial, the Federal and the Provincial liabilities, and yet leave sufficient margin for local bodies for local needs.

The real issues then are, how can India get fiscal autonomy, with power to reduce the cost of administration, by reducing the strength of the foreign agency, or doing away with it ? At present the scale of salaries which we are paying to the foreign administrators is tremendous as compared with the other countries of the world.

Compare these salaries with what is allowed in the United States, in Germany, in Great Britain, in France, in Japan, and see what a great difference there is.

Permit me respectfully to point out to you that the Indians are no longer children politically. They understand their affairs thoroughly. Any attempt to hoodwink them by confusing the real issues and raising clouds of dust, will react on those who attempt to do so. What we want is real political power. We are prepared to pay a reasonable price for our connection with the Empire, but the present position must change. As soon as we get fiscal autonomy, we shall ourselves do the great task of securing such a just distribution of whatever wealth we earn as will secure decent lives to the masses of our people. After all, it is they who form the nation. With the strings of power in the hands of British capitalists represented by the Secretary of State, and with a foreign bureaucracy controlling our lives day in and day out, we cannot help being sullen and discontented. The wonder is not that India is discontented, but that the people are so law abiding, docile and loyal. Any further strain on their loyalty might end in fatal results.

You have a great opportunity, Mr. Secretary, for winning the gratitude of an historic nation, comprising one-fifth of the human race. Remember that you will be making history in a way such as has not fallen to the lot of any of your predecessors. Your place in history will be determined by the amount of conscious courage and honesty of purpose you display in your great office. Remember, please, that India has been on this earth for thousands of years and will endure for all time to come unless some geologic cataclysm overtakes it, even after the Curzons and Sydenhams and the *Morning Post* have gone and been forgotten. India has had all kinds of good, bad, indifferent, benevolent and oppressive rulers. They are gone. Their memory—the good, the bad and the indifferent—abides in their deeds. So will it be with the British administrators also. Let it not be said by posterity that British statesmen at a psychological moment in their history (in 1917) failed to read the signs of the times. The time is with the people and the hands of the clock cannot be set back even by a Canute.

29. A CALL TO YOUNG INDIA

ONE OF the biggest evils of an alien rule is the tendency for dependence that it creates in the subject people, which naturally leads to divisions and differences over the distribution of crumbs, which fall from the master's table. When Lord Morley introduced his reforms in 1909 he planned to crush the advanced nationalists by taking the moderates under his wings. He gave a few posts to the latter, and gave a few others the opportunity of prefixing "honourable" to their names. Now Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford are playing the same game. Be it said to their credit, however, that they are doing it in a more masterly way than Lord Morley ever did. Morley was lacking in courage. Having been a theorist all his life he knew how to write, but had not the courage to put his principles into practice. Master of words, he was not quite a success as a doer of deeds. His statesmanship, if one may call it such, was devoid of faith as well as of imagination. Montagu, however, is, in certain respects, rising to the heights of statesmanship. But even then he has to go slow and haltingly. He cannot defy vested interests, ignore the junker element in Parliament and the country. Yet, in twelve months he has done more in the way of rallying the moderates than Morley did in five years. He has been giving appointment after appointment to the moderates and has completely won them over to his side. Perhaps the War created the occasion. Besides, he has the support of the Viceroy as well as the advantage of the world changes in his favour. Yet, making due allowance for these, one cannot but put him above Morley in his attempt to effect far-reaching reforms in the administration of India. This, however, is only by the way.

We had started by commenting on the fight for crumbs, which

A reprint of the pamphlet written by Lajpat Rai and issued in 1919 by the India Home Rule League, New York City.

is the natural result of an alien rule. We find it fully illustrated in the present political struggle that is proceeding in India. In Lord Morley's time the Indian Nationalists were divided into two classes, the so-called Moderates and the so-called Extremists. Now it is said that there are four—Moderates and Ultra-Moderates, Extremists and Ultra-Extremists. We have been carefully studying the pronouncements of all and anxiously watching the developments. The splits and differences and recrimination do not frighten us. In fact they add to our spirits. Heat indicates life. Friction is not "always" bad. Peace at any price is not always good. "Life is the real thing and not peace and quiet." We have been taught to love peace and quiet more than life, and that has brought about our downfall. The differences in the Nationalist camp indicate active thought, active life and struggle. We are happy over this indication. But we have to guard against their not being turned to destructive ends.

What makes us feel sorry is that so much feeling should be injected into matters which ought to be discussed on broad lines. We are more angry with the Moderates for the simple reason that they make such exaggerated claims for patience, experience, sobriety, statesmanship, past services and sacrifices, and yet are the loudest in denunciation and in shedding tears. We have many friends among them whom we revere and love and for whom we have the highest respect. We have absolutely no doubt of their sincerity, honesty and patriotism, but we cannot concede that they have the monopoly of these, or even of wisdom and sagacity. What perplexes us even more is that we cannot see any very radical differences between the respective political aspirations of the various parties. Of course, differences there are, but are they so material as to justify all the heat and passion that is being introduced into the discussion over the Reform Scheme ? Do they deserve all the froth and foam that is being generated on both sides ? Why have the Moderates seceded from the Congress[1] ? Why could they not stay in a minority, even for a year ? The so-called Extremists have been in minority for years.

Reverting to the Reform Scheme, we notice a substantial agreement that the Government Scheme is not satisfactory, and that it lacks essentials. All parties contend that it concedes practically no power to the people in the Central Government, and in that

respect is very defective. All insist that it must be modified on certain definite lines, giving almost the same power to the elected representatives of the people in the Central Government as is conceded in the Provincial Governments. The quarrel is mainly over words and details. One party calls the scheme "unsatisfactory and disappointing." The Moderates object to the use of these words. They do not want a definite period being fixed for the grant of full Home Rule, while the other faction demands it. One party is satisfied with the scheme for the Provincial Governments, the other party demands full autonomy in all the provinces. Moderate legislators, in Bengal and Bombay and the United Provinces have in their official capacities, demanded full autonomy for their respective provinces. The so-called Extremists demand it for all.

The Moderates are afraid lest too much criticism of the scheme might endanger it altogether. The opposition in England has unbalanced them. They forget that what is conceded is not being given as a matter of favour but "because it is impossible to govern India on old lines and because it is a necessity of the times," imposed by the progress of the world and the rapid strides that have taken place in the ideas of men and women about the functions of governments. They are still quoting the old, timeworn maxims about representative government and political democracy. They have not yet awakened to the consciousness that the old political masters are intellectually effete and dead. Their theories have been suppressed by newer ones which are holding the mind of the world in their grip. The world no longer swears by the words of Mill, Morley, Burke and Bryce or others of the old Liberal School. They are interesting landmarks on the highway of human thought, but no more the dispensers of light and the givers of hope. The world has advanced beyond the points covered by the their geniuses.

"The Montagu scheme cannot fail, because it is a necessity of the times." But even if it does fail, its failure will be no calamity. Its failure will leave two alternative courses open to the masters of India, either to introduce a better and more democratic scheme or to start an active policy of extended repression and suppression. We are not at all afraid of the latter, as there is nothing which gives vigour to a movement for liberty, as repression and suppression. Liberty delayed takes its vengeance on those who delay it. See Russia, Germany and Turkey. The British are too wise to indulge

in that. They will concede as well as repress. There is very little danger, then, of Mr. Montagu's scheme failing altogether. It is a policy of reform and repression. The Extremists again are childish in demanding a time-limit for the grant of full Home Rule, forgetting that the authority which fixes the time can cancel it later on. We shall get it when we deserve it.

Both parties forget that it is not in the nature of governments to concede more than is absolutely necessary to be conceded in the interest of their own safety. In fact, governments give the appearance of concession to what has really been won by the people. Judged in this light, the political leaders of India are fighting over crumbs. To us, sitting at a distance, they seem to be devoid of vision and lacking in firmness of principle. They are afraid of ghosts and what frightens them is not the strength of the Government but their own weakness. They have no faith in themselves. Some of them have been armchair politicians, writing mostly for profit and gain, occasionally giving a tiny fraction of their income in subscriptions ; or practising law and making millions out of the wretched pittances which the vast bulk of their countrymen make, to remove their hunger. They have always felt for the masses and have expressed their feelings in touching, sincere language, but they have done precious little to share what they possess, or have possessed, with the masses. Between them and the masses there is a gulf which they have never tried to bridge. They live in palaces while the masses have not even huts to live in. Most of them are Sirs or Rai Bahadurs, or Khan Bahadurs. They are proud of these titles. Their champions in the Press always give a string of "Sirs" in support of their political views. Too much authority, blind authority, mere authority, whether that of the Prince or the priest, of the Raja or the Nabob, of the oligarch or the official, or the wealthy and the prosperous is the bane of Indian life; yet these stalwarts of reform always take shelter behind big names. Their chief argument is to be found in Who's Who, and if the people who are with them are so many Sirs, so many Honourables, so many Rajas and Nabobs, their argument is conclusive. They are mortally afraid of saying or doing things which may offend the Government officials. Even in the selection of their officers, in the nominating of their leaders, they do not look to fitness and courage, but seek out the men who are more likely to be acceptable to the authorities. In their management of

the Indian National Congress, they have never hesitated to resort to caucus methods, to underhand intrigues,* to canvassing, to filling meetings with their adherents, and so on. They are well conversant with the so-called election methods of the Western democracies. Yet they get angry when the same methods are used by their rivals. Now that the Congress has fallen into the hands of the other party, they are calling to the Heavens to witness the calamity. They have wrecked the Congress, says the *Leader*. The Congress was "wrecked" the minute the Moderates left it. The Delhi Session has only registered a *fait accompli.*[2] Their opponents they run down as "youngsters." "demagogues," "inexperienced," "rash," "firebrands," and so on. The people they call "mobocracy." Anything disagreeable to them is immoral. Anything distasteful to them is gross stupidity. All the epithets which their erstwhile enemies and their present admirers in the Anglo-Indian press once used against them they are employing against such of their countrymen as do not follow their lead and will not recognize their authority. In a minority, they desire to rule the majority, even more autocratically than they did when they had a majority.

The Moderate papers are making great fuss over the fact of some of the old and the most respected leaders being on their side. Time after time they recall the names of..... filling columns with stories of their sacrifices. We have nothing but respect for these gentlemen, and admiration for their services. Nor do we deny that whatever they say should be heard with respect and attention. They are among the makers and moulders of Modern India and the country owes them gratitude. But if, after giving them a full and respectful hearing the country thinks differently, it is fully entitled to disregard their advice and go its own way.

A leader is one whose leadership satisfies and is effective, one who is always ahead of those whom he seeks to lead, who is fearless and courageous and, above all whose disinterestedness is above suspicion. He remains a leader so long as he maintains these qualities. "Once a leader is not always a leader. Leadership in a progressive community changes with the times and circumstances." It

*As an illustration of their methods we may refer to the Congress of 1896, 1907, 1914.

does not depend on age or learning ;* nor on titles and diplomas. Sometimes it is the duty of a leader to restrain, to check, and to warn, but the task becomes impossible if he allows his own thought to fall behind that of his erstwhile followers. In that case his warnings go unheeded and his attempt to restrain assumes the appearance of tyranny and leads to his fall. A leader who puts his own past services and sacrifices in the forefront of his arguments for a particular course of action puts himself in an awkward and somewhat ridiculous position, especially when his followers find that, comparing his present with the opinions expressed by him in the immediate past, he seems to have gone back on his own utterances, and for reasons not convincing. Then again a leader who begins to boast of his past services and sacrifices invites invidious comparison and odious criticism. Judged by the standard of sacrifices, tribulations and sufferings in the cause of the country, the Moderate leaders must appear very poor as compared with those who are leading the Extremists. Is there one man in the whole Moderate party whose sacrifices and sufferings amount to anything at all as compared with those of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, or Arabinda Ghose ? With the loss of Pandit Malaviya, the Moderate camp has lost the last man whose sacrifices could be put to the test of critical analysis, excepting, of course, the Servants of India. The others with their palatial homes, with large bank accounts, with titles before and after their names, with big estates and mills to make their own lives comfortable, and the lives of their children secure and snug can hardly talk of sacrifices. Why the very positions they occupy today they owe to their patriotism. It is ridiculous then, to claim an acceptance of their views on these grounds.

A few years ago the leading organs of the Moderate Party used to say that if anything or any Indian, appeared to be good and acceptable to the *Pioneer*, that thing and that Indian should be shunned, or at least looked upon with suspicion. They have lived, however, to see their goodselves admired and praised and eulogized not only by the *Pioneer*, but even the *London Times*, the *Englishman*

*Read the history of the various democratic movements n Europe and America. Read the biographies of Parnell and Redmond, Bryan and Roosevelt, Kropotkin and and Madame Breshkovskaya.

and the *Civil and Military Gazette.* We remember the days when some of these Moderate leaders used to praise the once Sir George Clarke (now Lord Sydenham)[3] to the skies. One of them once wrote that when Sir George speaks the whole country listens with stretched ears and bent heads. (We are not quoting the exact words.) Think of the change that has come in their attitude towards the then Sir George Clarke, the present Lord Sydenham. The truth is that all of us are liable to make mistakes. The Moderate leaders have been guilty of blunders in the past, their prudence, foresight, statesmanship and sobriety notwithstanding. Their blunders have been of both kinds, of commission as well as of omission. They have let opportunities for action and advance slip by for lack of courage and want of pluck, by too much prudence and too much expediency, by too much regard for personal safety, and personal welfare, by want of foresight and forethought, by ignorance of world conditions and world currents. All of us are more or less affected by self-interest. Who among us can boast of being absolutely selfless ? It is no calumny, therefore, to say that even Moderate leaders are and have been affected by personal considerations. There are few among men and women of all countries who are prepared to suffer for their convictions. Most of us are consciously or unconsciously affected in our opinions and judgments by personal, or family, or clannish, or party interests. In India certainly the number of such persons as are prepared to stand by their convictions even in the face of sufferings and death is very limited. If it were not so the Indians would not be where they are now. It is, in our judgment, extremely foolish, therefore, for any one to claim the acceptance of any views because they are held by Sir so and so or Honourable so and so. On the other hand, it is equally foolish to base any argument on false analogies or to indulge in catch words. Facts are facts and they must be faced.

We yield to none in our desire to see our country free, absolutely free. But our conception of freedom perhaps differs from that of both the Moderates and the Extremists. The Moderates want colonial self-government by steps, and so do the Extremists. They differ on steps. Both are prepared to agree to the overwhelming preponderance of power which the holders of property, the possessors of special privileges would maintain in their respective schemes over those that have nothing but their bodies and souls. Special

representation is being claimed for the landlord, the big merchant the capitalist, the aristocrat as well as for the Mussalman, for the Sikh, for the native Christian, for the domiciled European. These claims are almost all backed up by the Moderate leaders. There are few among them (all honour to those who are) who can freely vote in a way that will displease the big Zamindar, the Taluqdar, and the millowner. The greatest democratic leader of Bengal[1] is always anxious to keep on the side of the big property holders. He is very happy when they call him the tribune of the people. His clarion voice gives utterance to beautiful pharses and thoughts framed in inspiring language, but when the time for lofty action comes he is always on the side of property, and privilege, and power. He has his prototypes in other provinces also. The truth is that the Nationalist leaders are and have been laying too much emphasis on expediency and prudence and what they call tact. They have read Morley's book on compromise and they quote it in season and out of season. Their political thought is old-fashioned and sterile. Everything is bound to become sterile which is hedged round by considerations of excessive prudence and expediency so as to bury the element of truth and nobility in it deep down under the debris of policy. We do not favour being rash nor do we want to be dogmatic, imprudent, or careless. A certain amount of prudence and expediency and compromise are necessary in human affairs. One cannot always act on a truth the moment one begins to see it. But those who do and can so act deserve all honour. In the long run it is they who win. Nothing is so inspiring, so magnetic, so forceful in changing public opinion, and in transforming national character as readiness to suffer for truth, for principle, for right, for justice and for the cause. The moral effect of one such life on the development of a nation is equal to or perhaps exceeds that of one hundred well balanced, sober, prudent, calculating, compromising Moderates. Moderation is good so long as it does not become stale and sterile. Moderation in conduct is good so long as it is accompanied by an avowal of the truth. But immoderate moderation, or moderation run mad is as dangerous to national development and national welfare as avowed overboard extremism. We think the golden mean is reached when people are absolutely frank and truthful in thought and opinion, and in the expression of thought and opinion, but moderate in the application or enforcement of that truth for an orderly progress

of humanity. Detestable is demagogy, for the sake of demagogy, imprudence of speech and rashness of deed to court martyrdom or even applause. There is nothing meaner far more despicable than that. There are some people for whom applause is the breath of life; whose private life is full of meanness, littleness, jealousy, greed, selfishness and an overwhelming hankering for popularity, but who thunder forth in imitation of Moses, Christ, Buddha, and Govind Singh when they are on the platform. India in transition has both kinds of leaders. Every nation has. Even free nations like England, France, the United States and Japan have plenty of them. Our case becomes more palpable and attracts more attention because we are a subject people and, as such, every one has the presumption to lecture us and to hold up our faults for public exhibition in order to perpetrate or prolong their power over us. Let us not be down-hearted. It is a necessary phase through which we are passing. We are neither saints nor devils—only human beings subject to all the laws of change and growth.

Our patriotism is sometimes as tainted as that of leaders in free countries. Really speaking, there are no free peoples in the world. The democracies of the United States, Great Britain and France are only democracies in name. The men in power, those who possess property, enjoy privileges, are as tyrannical towards their own common people as they are towards us. Only they fear the former more than they fear us. They never do things for the sake of justice and fair-play. They do things when they are afraid of the consequences of not doing them. So long as they are safe or believe they are safe, they oppress their own people and their own countrymen almost as much as they do us. They exploit them mercilessly; they make them draw water and hew wood for them. No one need place much faith on their liberal or democratic professions. There are very few who are really liberal, who have the courage of their convictions, who act as they feel. Morleys and Bryces only differ in degree from Curzons and Milners. Do not pin your faith in any of them. At heart the Liberals and Conservatives are the same. The Liberals have killed Liberalism in Great Britain by their hypocritical, time-serving Imperialism and Capitalism.

The people from whom Young India should draw inspiration are those who live or have lived by the sweat of their brow, who are or have been producers, who know or have known what poverty and

ignorance and lack of opportunity and subservience to others mean. Even among them there are more talkers and writers who are professionals, who have big bank accounts and who amassed wealth by saying good things and playing on the imagination and fancy of the common people. Even they are not the real people who should inspire us in our struggle. Young India should stand by Keir Hardies, Lansburys and Smillies.[5]

To our extremist countrymen we beg to submit that in our judgment there is great force in the statement that complete independence will not be to our advantage. As for full Home Rule, so long as the masses do not show almost incontestably that they are with us, it is not likely to be granted, not because of the reasons that our national enemies advance, not for lack of intelligence or character; not because we are divided by cleavages of religion, race, language and culture; not because we have huge illiteracy; not even because we are too poor, but for different reasons. We are poor because others do not let us use what we have. Our illiteracy is no disgrace. Even in our illiteracy we are more sober, more thoughtful, more considerate than the literate millions of America and Europe. We are not lacking in character because we have more of self-control, more of plain honesty, more of simplicity, less of greed and less of the desire to kill others than the Europeans and Americans have. Neither are the cleavages of religion, race and language any bar to Home Rule in India. They are to be found in other countries which are free. What we lack is firmness to stand by our rights, vigour and determination to resist oppression, tyranny and wrong-doing whether practised by our own countrymen or by foreigners; readiness to suffer for the cause and the country; willingness to stand by what is right and truthful even if we lose the whole world by such a stand. But the chief reason is that we have no power to enforce our demand for Home Rule. The military argument, the argument of the "silver bullets," the argument of industrial strikes and Labour Unions are all lacking. So long as they are lacking, however much we may foam and fret we shall never get Home Rule.

We are neither Moderate nor Extremist, nor even "Revolutionary", in the ordinary sense of the word. In our judgment both the Moderates and the Extremists have so far failed to give the right lead.

The Moderates have taught us ultra-moderate prudence, expediency, over-cautiousness, dread of democracy and an undue respect for authority. Yet the Moderates produced great souls like Gokhale and Malaviya.

Nor have the Extremists been free from the vices of demagogy, conceit and swelling of the head. They have produced great souls, like Arabinda and Tilak, to speak only of the Hindus. The Mussalmans have produced some really good men like the Ali brothers, Jinnah, Hasan Imam and Rasul.

The man, however, who is after our own heart, though we do not always agree with him in politics, is Gandhi.

The Revolutionaries have shown great courage and spirit of sacrifice but they have also taught us lying and deception, double-dealing ond duplicity, beside assassination, robbery and dacoity. It is hopeless to expect a country to be great by any of these methods.

What the country needs is a band of leaders pledged to absolute truthfulness, frankness, openness and, above all, fearlessness and simplicity. We want leaders who will live like the common people, eating the food of the common people, dressing as the common people, sometimes working with their hands for their living and sharing with the common people their thoughts, their anxieties and their troubles. We want leaders who will not make false or equivocal defence whenever the authorities chose to prosecute them. We want leaders who will not be afraid to attack and criticise the men of property, power and privilege among their countrymen as fearlessly and mercilessly as they do the foreign exploiter, who will realize and preach that what they want is real democracy, genuine democracy, and not the mere substitution of the rule of property and privilege in place of the foreign Imperialists and Capitalists. We do not mind if the real thing comes a little late. What we want is genuine gold and not counterfeit coin. We do not want to give our time and energy and life for the benefit of the native exploiter, be he prince or priest. We want to preach the gospel of social democracy.

Now we do not want to be misunderstood. We know that we cannot fly the flag of Socialism. We do not understand Socialism. We have never studied it. We do not go by dogmas and

doctrines. We know this much that the present constitution of society is wrong and unjust. It is cruel and barbaric—even more barbaric than it ever was in primitive time, before the dawn of civilization. Civilization has brought misery and hunger, death and disease to the masses of mankind. We do not want to go back to the primitive age. We cannot go back, even if we would. We want an era of equal opportunity and equal justice to all. In our judgment it is the first duty of every government to see :

1. That not a single member of the body politic suffers from lack of clean and nourishing food, from want of sanitary housing and decent clothing.

2. That every child of a mother, whether it be of lawful or unlawful origin (every child is of lawful origin, in so far as he is the product of natural impulses and absolutely natural forces), shall get not only good food and good clothing, but ample opportunities for education and development on its own lines.

3. That every adult must contribute to the sum total of a nation's living. That every adult must engage himself or herself, in some productive or creative work, whether physical or intellectual.

4. That every member of society gets sufficient leisure to devote himself to the cultivation of the finer side of himself.

5. That no one kills another unless in self-defence or in defence of society.

6. That every one has, according to the need of himself and his family, free access to land, air, water and other natural and artificial products, necessary to make a decent living and lead a decent life.

7. That no one uses another against his or her will, by force or threat.

8. That every one has an equal political status except when by common consent and for common purposes he or she is invested with a higher status for a temporary period.

9. That every one is entitled to select his or her own habitat and membership in local group, into which he or she likes to gain admittance, provided he or she does not thereby infringe on the liberties or rights of others.

10. That men and women are treated alike with rights and obligations differentiated only by their physical constitutions.

Subject to these principles, if any member of a social group makes more wealth or comes into possession of it by the sweat of his brow he is welcome to have it and enjoy it if thereby he inflicts no wrong on others, jointly or severally.

These are our principles and we want a body of sincere men to preach them in India.

In our judgment the era of political revolutions is over. It is short-sighted to try to bring about revolutions by assassinations, murders, terrorism or dacoity, only to find that we have substituted one class of masters for another. What we need is none of these methods.

We want a body of Indian politicians to agitate and press the claim that every tiller of the soil gets sufficient land or such tenure as will enable him to earn a decent and comfortable living. The Government has no right to tax a man whose income is not sufficient for the elemental needs of himself and those who are dependent on him. Nor has the landlord any right to squeeze all he can out of starving cultivators, regardless of the fact that what is left is sufficient for him and his family or not. Down with the foolish doctrine of demand and supply. Down with competition. We insist that the Government of India, whether manned by the British or by the Indian, so change the land laws as to secure a sufficient holding to every tiller of the soil on terms which will enable him to live a decent life.

The inauguration of new industries is very good. We want industrial development, but even there we do not want it under conditions which will deny the wage-earner a decent living wage. We insist upon the recognition of the right of every human being to a decent living made out of land or from industries. We maintain that a body politic which does not recognize that duty, is a lawlesss body existing on the exploitation of human beings. All other needs of a body politic, the need of security from without and from within, the need for public works, for highly paid Government servants, for national pleasures, must be subject to this elementary duty. We want the Indian political leaders to take up that question and to hammer it. It will have its effect on all legislation. It will create a political and economic consciousness among the masses which will,

in time, become irresistible. Besides it will be an acid test of the sincerity of those Britishers who say that they are in India in the interest of and for the good of the masses and who oppose Home Rule because they believe that unless the masses are politically conscious of their rights, their interest can be better looked after by the British officials than by their own educated and propertied countrymen.

We are sorry to see well intentioned, apparently honest, intelligent countrymen wasting their breath, time and energy on non-essentials and ignoring essentials. By so doing they distract the public mind and prevent the focussing of public attention on matters which really count.

In all humiliation and earnestness we submit these lines for their consideration and attention, though we can anticipate the reply "unpractical, impossible, inexpedient." To lawyers, landlords, big capitalists, and big officials, well-paid editors, and titled gentlemen a scheme like that must always appear impractical.

But what about the "Servants of India" ? Why are they wasting away their lives to bolster up capitalism ? Perhaps by force of habit—and for want of anything better to do. Why are they licking the boots of the bureaucracy, why are they cringing before Sirs. Justices, and Rajas ? Why, we repeat and pause for a reply.

30. NEED FOR PUBLICITY ABROAD

As a fellow-worker in the public life of the country for the last 35 years, I beg leave to approach you with the following lines on the common needs of our common country. However we may differ in our methods of work and immediate policy, however we may differ in our opinion of the Reform Scheme, we are all agreed on fundamentals and we all desire for our country an honourable place in the nations of the world. The world today has been so closely knit together by means of easy transportation and communication that no nation, however isolated she might have been in the past, can afford to ignore the force of public opinion in the various civilized countries of the world.

A few years ago, the affairs of India mattered precious little to the people of the United States. The world was interested in our philosophy and in our views on religion but no one cared much about the political and economic condition under which we lived. The chief economic interest of the manufacturing countries centred in the markets they could find in our country for the supply on favourable terms and large quantities to them, of our raw materials. Even today that is their chief interest. But the War and the forces let loose by the War have forced their attention to our political institutions.

In the United States today, the daily, the weekly and the monthly press of the country is constantly full of references to India. Several references have of late been made to India in the Federal Legislature. Attached to this letter, you will find an extract from a speech delivered by Senator Reed in the Senate of the United States.[1] The opinions of Senator Reed and the misconceptions

Reproduced from *The Tribune* of 4 September 1919. This was an open letter addressed to the Indian leaders who were in London in 1919. The letter is dated New York City, 25 July 1919.

underlying them are typical of a large number of the United States publicists. They are more the result of ignorance than of prejudice, or say, prejudice born of ignorance. The civilized world's ignorance about India, her culture, her history, her politics and her economics is simply colossal. People hold very peculiar views about us. Our mysticism has sometimes amused and sometimes repelled them; our poetry and philosophy have at times been praised. Beyond this, the affairs of India have had little interest for the rest of mankind.

But of late there has been a slight change. This change has been brought about by the War, as also by the active effort of those who have by word, written and spoken, tried in their own humble way and by their own resources, to disseminate knowledge about Indian conditions. They have had to work at great risk and under great difficulty. Placed between two fires, that of their revolutionary countrymen on one side, and of the British Imperialists and their friends on the other, they have exposed themselves to dangers of which you can have no conception. But they have done their work. They have done it out of a sense of duty to their country and because of their faith in the justice and the righteousness of their cause. It may be that they have sometimes erred, as everyone of us is liable to. But considering everything, they are confident that the work done by them will bear good fruit, in the course of time.

So far I have spoken of this work in a plural sense. Now I wish to speak for myself. Not for a single moment during these five years, have I let myself be deluded by any hope in foreign intervention. From the moment I landed in the United States, I made it clear to all concerned, Indians and non-Indians, that I had no faith in Germany's power or friendship. I said that to my countrymen in private conferences and repeated it in the press and on the platform. Here I will cite only one piece of evidence that has been authoritatively included in a volume recently issued by the Chief of the New York Bomb Squad, Thomas J. Tunney, who gives a summary of his squad's achievements during the War. This officer conducted the preliminary investigation in the German-Hindu plot, which led to the arrest of the Hindu leaders of the movement. On page 89 is published a letter originally written in code by one of the Hindu leaders in the United States to another leader in Germany or Switzerland. Speaking of his own work in Japan he remarks: "Even

Lajpat Rai, *who slights our work*, quite often admits in three months more solid work done there than any other part of the world outside India in number of years."

The words underlined are particularly significant as in a slight degree they express my mental attitude towards the work of the Indian revolutionaries in America which has been one of contempt mixed with pity. In the pamphlets and books published by me during this period as well as in newspaper articles, I have spoken quite explicitly. But I attach more importance to this remark as it occurs in a confidential and secret communication which was not meant for publication and in which the writer indulged in a heart to heart exchange of views with one of the principal leaders of the movement in Germany. The truth or otherwise of the rest of the sentence is irrelevant for the purposes of this letter.

I do not believe and have never believed that our salvation will come from outside. On principle, I am opposed to relying on foreign political or military help. Nor do I believe that foreign criticism of British policy is likely to affect the decisions of the British Government relating to India to any considerable extent. I have no delusions on that score. But I do believe that a favourable opinion towards Indian aspirations in countries other than Great Britain is a valuable asset in our struggle for freedom. We cannot afford to neglect world opinion except at our peril.

I must confess with shame that so far we have not paid sufficient attention to work in this connection even in Great Britain, Ireland and the other parts of the British Empire. Whatever we have done has been done half-heartedly. We have not used the modern methods of publicity. We have not made enough sacrifices in time and money. So far as the rest of the world is concerned, we have paid no heed to what it thinks about us and of us. We have behaved as if it did not exist for us. This has harmed us considerably. The world holds us in contempt, entertains wrong and peculiar views of our history, our lives, our institutions and our aspirations. We cannot blame them for this as we have made no attempt to educate them on right lines. We have let judgment go against us by default.

We have every reason to be grateful for the work done by Vivekanand and lately by Rabindranath Tagore and also by the

Theosophical Society, in creating a certain respect for us in the learned circles of the world. Be it said to the credit of the American Theosophists that under the influence of Mrs. Besant they have for the last three or four years been quite assiduous in voicing our aspirations and in educating American public opinion about India. For this our hearty thanks are due to them and chiefly to the great woman who has inspired their activities. But after all, this is only little, very little. During the War all of us were handicapped by causes and circumstances beyond our control. The experience of the War has given us an insight into the exigencies of the situation. Henceforth, we should do more and on a better scale. In the following paragraphs I wish to lay before you the points that deserve your attention. I earnestly beg of you to give your best thought to them, and if possible to decide to take some concerted action relating thereto before you return home. Perhaps some of you may find time to visit the United States before going back. If so, I assure you that your visit will be amply repaid by a substantial addition to your knowledge of world conditions. The India Home Rule League of America extends to you all, regardless of party, a warm invitation. We will do our best to make your visit pleasant and profitable. This country is in a way the epitome of the world. Here you can come into contact with the representatives of all countries, cultures, and parties and from them you can know about conditions in other countries without going to those countries. Every nationality on the face of the earth has its national organization and its information bureau here, each of which agitates, educates and watches. Every government has its publicity bureau which educates, guides and watches public opinion in the interests of its Government. If mighty Governments do that, well may their example be followed in an humble way by private national agencies. Now to come to the points :

1. INFORMATION BUREAUS

We must have permanent Indian information bureaus at least in New York, Tokyo and Paris. These bureaus should be officered and staffed by Indians who have lived in these countries and know them. But in every case the head should be an Indian publicist of judgment, tact, and experience. It is important that the information given by these bureaus be exact and reliable, free from exaggeration and distortion.

These information bureaus can serve as centres of trade information also. The different Swadeshi chambers of commerce and the publishers and merchants of India ought to be made to take interest in their maintenance. If properly managed they can be made useful in enabling our export and import merchants to trade direct with foreign countries and thus save for themselves the profits which at present the foreign manned commission agencies make. I am confident that if wisely managed and economically conducted, these bureaus will, in the course of time, pay their own way.

2. PUBLICITY BUREAUS

Besides London, Edinburgh, Dublin, Canada, South Africa and Australia, we should have publicity bureaus in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Tokyo, Shanghai and Paris. These bureaus should represent our political and economic aspirations. They should be organized on an educational basis. It should be their business to supply literature, lectures on Indian topics, as well as to supply themes for cinema and the stage. Perhaps, the first and the second may be combined into one office, though in my judgment it will be prudent to keep the two apart. The business of the first should be to supply information. The business of the second should be propaganda. They will cooperate, but both need not be one and the same.

3. BOOKS

It is absolutely necessary that more Indians should write books on Indian topics for the use of the other peoples of the world. These books should be published in Europe and America in different European languages. If printed in India and meant for foreign circulation they should be well printed and on good paper. Active efforts should be made to interest the peoples of the other countries in our literature. Steps should be taken to place our periodical literature on the shelves of the big libraries of the world and to make them easily accessible to those who want to buy them. I have received of late several requests for such information and have replied to more than one inquiry. I have recommended the *Modern Review*, the *Indian Review*, the *Hindustan Review*, the *Leader*, the *New India*, the *Tribune*, the *Times of India*, the *Bombay Chronicle*, the *Bengalee*, the *Hindu* and the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*. I mention these names as typical of the spirit in which I wish this work to be carried on.

4. News Agencies

A purely Indian news-service between India and the principal civilized countries of the world is an absolute necessity which requires the immediate attention of the Indian leaders of thought and commerce. By news-service I mean telegraphic as well as otherwise.

I am strongly of the opinion that the time has come for our newspapers and journals to take concerted action to have their own correspondents in the different important centres of the world. It is even more necessary that they should depute special correspondents and investigators to study the problems of other countries, particularly in their bearing on India and make their reports for the information of the Indian public. How long is the Indian public to be fed on the stories of other countries' affairs supplied by Anglo-Indians ? There are certain things which can only be studied on the spot and which cannot be learnt by a perusal of the press of a country.

5. Exchange Professors

Steps should be taken to induce some foreign universities. especially American, to exchange teachers and professors with India, such as they do with Japan, and used to do before the War with Germany.

A word to my Muslim countrymen. Nothing has pained me so much during the course of my travels as the dense ignorance and prejudice that prevails in the United States about Islam and Islamic countries. You come across friends of China, Japan and India but during my five years' travels I have never come across a single person who spoke well of Islam and Islamic communities. With a Muslim friend, I once had the misfortune of attending a debate on the future of the Turkish Empire. The case for the Turks was stated by a Turk. But those who replied to him showed such gross ignorance and undisguised enmity and bias that it was difficult for me to listen to all that was said with equanimity. The spokesman for the Turks handled the situation badly and aroused a volume of prejudice against himself. The Turks have a horrible reputation and it required a great deal of tact, judgement and skill to put the case for the Mussalman communities in a way so as to excite the sympathy of the audience. In the end, at my suggestion, my

companion spoke and did a little to soften the prejudice. But after all, his was a solitary voice.

The Muslim leaders of India owe a duty to their faith, to their fellow-religionists, to themselves, to have few competent spokesmen in all the important countries of the world. This is a duty which needs their immediate attention. It is the duty of all Indians, regardless of creed, to vindicate the good name of Islam and to claim the same justice and fairplay for Islamic communities as is being demanded for the peoples of other faiths, whenever they can do so with effect. But it goes without saying that the Muslims themselves have a responsibility which brooks no delay and no shirking. If they neglect it they will do so only at their peril.

There are other matters on which I would like to address the Indian leaders, but I am afraid this letter has already exceeded its intended size and moreover it contains all the essential points which I would bring to your notice. Whatever our differences at home, I feel that we must sink them to do the work of educating world opinion about our country and our aspirations by concerted, judicious and effective methods. We cannot let ourselves be represented by the militant revolutionaries on the one hand and by the reactionary Imperialists on the other. I should like you to forget the personality of the writer of the letter and to consider his suggestions on their merits with due respect.

31. REFLECTIONS ON REVOLUTIONS

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS ago when I was a young man I was very fond of Mazzini, the great Italian patriot, and his writings. For a number of years I was in a way obsessed by the desire to read everything written by or relating to him that was to be found in the English language. Some of them I read more than once. Mazzini's life and his writings have left an almost ineffable impression on my mind. I do not accept all his views but I belive that in the loftiness of his political ideals, the purity of his political morality and the high tone of his patriotism, he has not been outrivalled by any other great man in Europe or in America.

For several years past I have made it my business to acquaint myself with the histories of revolutionary movements in the different parts of the world. And from this rather extensive study I have been able to deduce certain general principles which I set forth below. I do not believe in dogmas. Revolutions are above dogmas. Every revolution must have its own creed, yet there are certain general principles underlying revolutionary activities which can safely he stated in general terms for the consideration of those who are interested in the subject.

1. No nation deserves to be free which cannot win its freedom, and is not prepared to fight for it, if necessary. The latest endorsement of this principle comes from a most conservative quarter. Bonar Law, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, speaking some months ago at the London Lord Mayor's banquet, said, in reference to the situation in Russia that, "no nation has won or preserved freedom which was not prepared to fight for it, which

Originally published in *The Young India*, the monthly published in New York, for September 1918. It was signed "A Student of Revolutions."

was not ready to strain every nerve to drive the invader from her soil."

2. Freedom won, principally, by outside help is liable to be easily lost. "By themselves must nations be made," is true to-day as ever.

3. The capacity to fight for freedom is as much a moral and a spiritual asset as it is physical and scientific.

4. Revolutions in order to be fruitful must have a moral and humane foundation. They must have a popular basis and should be promoted only in the interest of general democracy. "For the people and by the people" must be their slogan.

5. Secret movements are a double-edged weapon. While they may be necessary against entrenched and armed autocracy they must be jealously guarded against the machinations of selfish, ambitious and unscrupulous adventurers who may otherwise be tempted to use them for purposes of personal enrichment, and aggrandizement. The less secrecy a revolutionary movement has, the better for its moral and ethical side.

6. Discipline and judgement are as much necessary for the success of a revolutionary movement as courage and initiative.

7. No revolutionary movement can afford to be reckless in the expenditure of its man power. The revolutionaries are as a rule few. To sacrifice them recklessly is a crime more serious than ordinary murder. Again, the revolutionaries who are prepared to die are more often than not, amongst the best and the truest of their lot. Their premature loss in the early stages of the movement deprives the latter of its inspiring figures and brings to the front men of inferior moral calibre whose greed for power, excess of personal ambition and inexperience delays the success of the movement and brings it into contempt and ridicule.

8. A revolutionary movement cannot from its nature be run on absolutely democratic lines. Yet the revolutionary autocrats must be not only of towering intellect, possessing in an extra-ordinary degree powers of leadership but also of moral character of the highest type. Revolutionary leadership is never safe when lodged in men who have too many weaknesses of the flesh and are not distinguished for over-scrupulousness in money matters and in the

impartial and disinterested use of their power.

9. The greatest asset of a revolutionary movement is the faith of its adherents. Their success in deliberation, organization and action will be only in proportion to their faith in the righteousness of their cause, in their capacity to win by determination, perseverance and courage ; and even more so, in proportion to their faith in their personal righteousness—the disinterestedness of their motives, their capacity for self-control and self-restraint and their readiness to put their cause above everything else.

10. A revolutionary movement must be based on reason and not on blind faith. The leaders must be fully conscious of the difficulties and obstacles in their way. They must not play to the gallery too often ; nor should they indulge in bluff too frequently.

11. In all representations to their allies, if there are any, they must be absolutely truthful and straightforward.

12. Above all they must be possessed of an extraordinary amount of patience as distinguished from procrastination. The too much calculating and prudent revolutionary sometimes lets golden opportunities for action slip off his hands. He thereby hampers the movement by his lack of vision and courage. But a man who by reckless bluff endangers the safety of his fellow workers and thereby causes disproportionate losses to the cause, unconsciously brings about a demoralization which is even more fatal and sometimes final.

13. Much should not be built on temporary successes. The revolutionary movement must have its martyrs. No movement so thrives on the blood of its martyrs as a movement for freedom ; but an organization which sends its adherents to certain death for the sake of martyrdom alone, is soon discredited.

32 SUFFER IN PURSUIT OF FREEDOM

CIRCUMSTANCES beyond my control have prevented my taking part in the great movement that you are leading for the uplift of our common Motherland.[1] I am, however, desirous of conveying to you my hearty admiration for your noble stand, and my unqualified appreciation of your high souled patriotism.

During my absence from India, I have learnt and unlearnt a great deal. This is no place to make a full confession of faith. But I want to say that, although I do not fully agree with your line of thought, I am in substantial agreement with your conclusions as to what we should do. Never before have I been more convinced of the futility of attempts to bring about a forcible revolution in India. Terrorism, too, in my judgment, is not only futile but sinful. Secret propaganda and secret societies may have some justification in the Government's desire to prohibit and penalize all kinds of open work, but in the long run this ends in the demoralization of those who take part in them. I believe that no nation deserves or will win freedom which is not prepared to suffer for it. When I say that, I mean the suffering in pursuit of freedom, and not for lack of it. In India we have plenty of the latter and not sufficient of the former. We have so far done precious little to deserve freedom and we have done still less to educate our people as to what constitutes real freedom. The sacrifices and sufferings we have so far undergone in our fight for freedom are too trivial to be crowned with success.

I am therefore in full sympathy with the general spirit of your propaganda. I may be unable to sign the full pledge of a Satyagrahi, but if and when I return to India I shall sign the "pure Swadeshi vow."

Letter to Mahatma Gandhi, published in the *Young India*, 13 August 1919.

You will be pleased to learn that most of the young Indians in this country have a deep sentiment of reverence for you. One of them, at one time a faithful follower of Hardyal, writes:

"What we need now are the leaders of the type of Mahatma Gandhi. We do not want armed resistance. We do not want passive resistance. What we want is something super, and that is what Mahatma is advocating. I have concluded that the methods which Hardyal advocated are not wise and sane for any part of the world. We want to get away from murder, assassination, conflagration and terrorism. The foundation in the past was laid upon bloodshed, and we have had enough of it, but now the foundation must be laid on justice and freedom to individuals, so that the same be palpable in the future. Hardyal has, by giving these ideas degraded himself, and I am afraid it may affect some of the young men who always followed him blindly. It is our misfortune that our leaders instead of going up. are going down. The crying need of India is leaders of the type of Gandhi, staunch in their principles, which can be applied to almost every part of the world."

How I wish I had been in India to share in full the misfortunes of my countrymen. My heart bleeds for them, but more for myself in having been deprived of the opportunity to serve and suffer.

33. THE GREATEST NEED OF THE COUNTRY

THE INDIAN publicists must recognise once for all that the country will not make any appreciable progress towards freedom if they must always counsel prudence and sitting on the fence. There is some risk in every enterprise. There are great risks in the enterprise of preparing a nation for the struggle for freedom. While no safeguard ought to be neglected for avoiding manifestations of lawlessness and recourse to violence, the movement for freedom must be accelerated by *personal risks and individual or group sufferings*. I am thus whole-heartedly in favour of your policy of passive resistance, and after giving my most careful consideration to what your critics have said, I have failed to find therein anything cogent to convince me to the contrary. I deplore the excesses at Amritsar, Kasur, Gujranwala and other places but judging from a distance, I am proud of the success you achieved in this first attempt at passive resistance in India. It is an achievement unique in our history, nay even in the history of the world. It has raised the political consciousness of the country by one big leap and also raised the country in the estimation of the world.

Passive resistance ought to be resorted to with great care and caution. It should not be allowed to descend to the level of the ridiculous. But when after wise calculation it is decided to have recourse to it, everyone should be prepared for casualties. My heart bleeds for the sufferings of my countrymen of the Punjab and I am extremely sorry that certain things should have happened as they did at Amritsar, Gujranwala and Kasur, but otherwise I am proud of the success of the all-India *Hartal*.[1] In matters like these success is not to be reckoned in rupees and annas or even in the actual attitude of the Government but in the spirit which is evoked by the undertaking.

Letter to Mahatma Gandhi, published in the *Young India*, 13 November 1919.

Mahatmaji, I for one, am proud of you, and of my country, even more than I ever was before.

The Congress has been trying to educate those who were already educated. The Congress leaders have looked to their rulers for the redress of their grievances, you look to the soul force of the country. It is the latter along with economic force, that will win in the end. If the salvation of the country has to depend on our English educated countrymen then it will never be achieved. Even the Government will not make any concessions unless they know that your demands are backed by the people. The people must be educated politically and they cannot be educated by the methods so far followed by the Congress leaders. Pardon me, Sir, (I have already earned a name for being tactless and indiscreet) for saying bluntly, that the old Congress leaders have always felt shy of the masses.

I have no faith in the sincerity of the Indo-British association, nor do I believe in the propaganda started by the Dr. Nair School of Non-Brahman politicians of the South,[2] but are all their statements about the educated leaders having been rather cold towards the masses entirely devoid of truth ? While we have felt that our own incomes, counted in hundreds and thousands and lacs, were small, we never felt *sufficiently* that the poor in India required at least tens. But for the efforts of a Digby and a Naoroji the statements of the Anglo-Indians about the prosperity of the masses might have remained unrefuted. How many of our leading publicists have even tried to understand the troubles of the masses by actual contact with them ? They have made speeches, written loads of articles full of generalities and common platitudes, but how many of them can honestly say that they know of the condition of the masses by personal contact. The Servants of India, the Seva Samitis, the volunteers in Bengal and in the Punjab have been doing a little, the leaders have given a few rupees in charity, now and then, but as to a real substantial effort to understand and realise their misery there has not been much of that. As to any of us serving to help them, why that has never entered our heads. We have been objecting to our rulers spending so much money on their annual trips to the hills. What have we been doing ourselves ? The fact is that we have set up an extravagant standard of importance to what we are pleased to call 'brain work' as against

manual work. A successful lawyer making from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 5,000 a month is entitled to spend three months on the hills to take rest while a farmer or a trader or a clerk not making more than 100 or 200 or 300 or even 500 rupees a year must rot in the plains. Is really the work of a lawyer of more use to the nation than that of a farmer, or a teacher or a miner ? I am not saying this in a spirit of carping criticism. I have been one of them doing no better and no worse. But I am saying this because in my judgment the spirit of our political movement requires a complete change. The country will never be free, it will not deserve to be free, as long as it does not produce leaders, who will look to the people, rather than to the authorities, for inspiration, for guidance, for light. Let me say in all sincerity that the people in India as elsewhere are much more honest, sincere and self-sacrificing than their so-called educated leaders. They are unlettered, unversed in the use of diplomatic lies. but even when they lie you can easily find out what is in their mind than you can in the case of the so-called educated leaders. Who among us does not lie ? Some utter diplomatic lies, others unsophisticated, undiluted, bare lies. An ordinary labourer is much more honest and truthful than the greatest among the English statesmen. He robs no one, he deceives none, he imposes on none. He works hard, lives a life of truth. What is true of Great Britain is true of India. Let us give up camouflaging and fix our mind on the truth. What our masses need most are not sermons on the subtleties of Vedanta or Vairagya, nor lectures on self-government, but right comradely association, brotherly sympathy, and easy, unsophisticated, unfettered communication with their better educated and better situated countrymen. Give them that and you will sooner uplift the country, than by centuries of lectures and sermons and by yards of resolutions. Having seen some of the best parts of the world, I have come to the conclusion that the Indian masses are comparatively more intelligent, more sober, more amenable to reason than any other people similarly situated. We have to make them conscious of their great potentialities by working *with them* in a spirit of cooperation and not working *for them* in a spirit of patronage.

The greatest need of the country, as it appears to me, is the economic uplift of the masses accompanied by universal education of the right sort. If I had any influence over the Indian Press I would beg of them to carry the following captions in big capital

letters over the first page of every newspaper, in every issue :

The greatest need of the Country
Milk for babies,
Food for adults,
Education for all.

The government must supply these or let us rule ourselevs. The nation must be made to realise that no one is entitled to any milk unless the babies first, the mothers, the sick and the invalid next, have got it ; that no one is entitled to luxuries, not even the officials, unless every man and woman in the nation has been well-fed. This is just by way of illustration.

An organisation should be started in every district to make a full and economic survey of the country as may be possible. These organisations should prepare charts of minimum average standards of food and clothing required for a healthy and sufficient life with figures and facts. We will then be in a position to give the lie to the oft-repeated statements of prosperity made by officials. Why do not these Non-Brahman organisations in the Deccan do this work ? I think it is time that our political agitators instead of trading in phrases should uncover facts.

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to say that mere figures will remove poverty. By no means. Figures will expose the poverty and the misery of the country as no general phrases can.

The thing to be immediately done is to organise the country for economic purposes starting with the peasants and the labourers. We must start from the bottom. The top people will take care of themselves. I want more of economic action, not necessarily at the cost of political talk, but in addition to it and as a necessary fulcrum for it. The nation must be fed on truth and not on catch phrases.

1. No nation which has Imperial ambition and the power to satisfy it can be said to have any sense of justice or can be admired as a champion of freedom and democracy. The two things are inconsistent. You may, if you like, admire the people thereof for power, strength, statesmanship or enlightened selfishness, but when you admire them for their 'sense of justice' or for their 'love of freedom' you say what is not true, never mind whether you do it

consciously for the sake of expediency or unconsciously out of habit. In my judgment the Indian leaders, who constantly harp on the British sense of justice, and of the British love of freedom of all people, mislead their people and thereby cause a great deal of harm to the cause of political progress in their country. Instead of making the people realise the situation as it is, and letting them adapt themselves to it for the purposes of progress on right lines they cover the situation with a lot of camouflage and thereby do positive harm to the cause of their country. British Imperialism is as selfish and autocratic as any Imperialism in the history of the world ever was or could be. We may appeal to the British in the name of justice, if we must, but we should not labour under any misapprehension that British justice is any way better than any other Imperial justice. In the history of the British Empire 'justice' was never done to the claims of any dependency or colony, except under extreme pressure and for selfish reasons. Even in the case of South Africa it was more enlightened self-interest than pure unadulterated love of justice that led Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman to grant them Dominion Status.

2. I believe that comparatively speaking there is a larger percentage of true and honest Internationalists in Great Britain than in any other country in the world except perhaps in Russia and the United States. These English Internationalists do sincerely believe in justice and liberty for all people. But they are in a hopeless minority, and consequently their influence on British statesmanship is extremely limited.

3. The only classes in Great Britain to whom it is any use appealing for International justice are the socialists or the labourites. The Liberal party contains some very fine souls, but the bulk of them are rank Imperialists and their Imperialism is, in my judgment, more harmful to the world of dependencies than that of Tories. The Tories have little recourse to camouflage, they are brutally frank, blunt and outspoken in their aims and politics. A water and milk kind of Liberalism is a positive danger to a nation striving for freedom. What the latter needs is the truth, so that she may know what to do. In their economic policy the Tories are more honest than the Liberals. Both are devoted Imperialists ; but the Tories make no pretence of their love of democracy in the abstract. The Liberals talk a great deal of justice and democracy and liberty, but

when the time for action comes they act even worse than the Tories.

4 I think that the Indian leaders should tell their people the truth and nothing but the truth. The law will not perhaps allow of the whole truth being told. The people ought to know that it is foolish for them to appeal to the Liberals, that the Liberals will do nothing for them, and to take shelter under the hackneyed utterances of our old leaders about the British sense of justice and the British love for freedom, etc. is just deceiving themselves.

There is little justice even in Great Britain. Whenever there is a clash of interests, the ruling classes treat their poor compatriots as ruthlessly as they do in India. In England the poor classes have, by the power of vote and by organised action, economic and political, succeeded in bettering their condition. Their appeals to the sense of justice of the ruling classes are as fruitless as ours are and will be. Whatever they have gained they have won by the mere force of organised action. If the Indians want to get their rights, they have just to be conscious of their rights and organise. They will never get anything by appealing to the British sense of justice. They must use all the weapons that the governed classes in America and in Great Britain have used and are using for achieving the purpose. In these countries the bulk of the population is opposed to the use of violence or force, not on ethical grounds so much as practical. It is considered useless and demoralising to threaten violence, or to try to use force against organised government forces. If it is so in countries where everyone is free to keep and learn the use of firearms it is even more so in India. Ethics aside, the policy of using violence or force to oust the British from India is foolish. Indian youths desirous of serving their country and of advancing the cause of freedom must learn to control their temper. I think that at times it is very difficult to do so and looks cowardly to take things lying down but then the outlet should be found in other ways. I am not in favour of taking insults, individual or national, in a spirit of meek submission, but I am strongly convinced of the futility of force for national purposes. I have nothing to add to what I have already said in my previous letter about terrorism and secret societies.

34. MODERN AND ANCIENT IDEALS

SOME DAYS AGO in response to your desire I sent you a rather lengthy letter, in which I developed some of my views, which had been briefly hinted at in the first letter I had written to you. Since the second letter was posted, I have been reflecting whether I had not been rather unduly critical of my educated countrymen in general, and the old leaders, in particular. Considering the education they received and the environments in which they were brought up could they have acted differently? Does not then the responsiblility of their conduct lie on the system of education in vogue in India? I have expressed my views on education in a series of articles, some of which have been published in the *Modern Review*, and the others will be found in a book which will be shortly published in England[1]. I do not propose to repeat what I have said in those articles and in that book, but I am going to take advantage of this opportunity in giving expression to some thoughts, which have not been adequately dealt with in that series.

We have so far, I am afraid, paid too much attention to the machinery of education and only little, very little, to aims and ideals or even the right methods. In considering the latter, we may as well divide them into modern and ancient. Under the term modern, we include the ideas that have had the world in their grip since the advent of the Industrial Revolution. Under ancient we consider all the systems of education that prevailed in the world before that.

The ancients paid much, too much attention to 'life after death', to the study of the 'scriptures', to the mastery of languages and to rituals and formulas. They professed to care more for soul than body, they tortured the latter and tried to live lives

Letter to Mahatma Gandhi, published in the *Young India*, 17 Deecember 1919.

that to the moderns seem to be unnatural. In learning languages they devoted precious years to grammar, syntax and prosody and pronunciation, and what was left was mainly given to the ritulas and formulas. Under that system religion was more or less identified with the latter. It depended more on form than spirit, more on dogma than character. more on beliefs than deeds. In trying to revive the ancient system we have so far failed to get rid of the superficialities. Even in reformed religious seminaries, religion still continues to be buried in form and formulas, dogmas and creeds, books and Shastras. Even when our teachers and professors and lecturers expound the Upanishads they care more for the letter of the text than for the spirit. Everyone uses them for the support of his own creed. What we need is not a creed but Dharma. Creed does not help us, at least not much, to find our souls. Our souls we can find only by looking inward and adjusting our outward circumstances to it. No one can lead a life of Dharma unless his outward and inward beings are in harmony, unless he thinks rightly, feels rightly and acts rightly. No education which fails to help us to that end is worthy of being called religious. Religion does not consist of contemplation only, but contemplation and action. Religion cannot be taught. It is a thing which grows. It cannot grow in a soil which has not been cleared of the falsities of thought and life. People who have to sing songs of loyalty to order or to pass resolutions in which they do not believe, or to admire men whom they detest, or to conceal thoughts which should be expressed, make a caricature of religion when they start teaching it. No one should attempt to teach religion unless he is prepared to suffer for the whole truth. I believe that Dharma murdered or mutilated or strangled becomes very dangerous to those professing to follow it in a mutilated form. To attempt to divorce Dharma from life is a very very risky affair. Then for Dharma to justify the existing social structure on the basis of *Karma* and upholding the prevailing ideas as to property, inheritance, marriage, law and government is perpetuating the *untruth*. The 'modern' system of education has a different kind of curse on its head. It is buried in textbooks, examinations and diplomas. It extols and holds for admiration all the prevailing ideas of property and marriage, government and law.

We have been educated and brought up under a system of

life which gives property and wealth the position of God. We talk of an incorporal, immaterial, just, merciful and all-wise God, but all the time the education we receive and the impetus we get from our surroundings exhort us to believe that the real God, to be worshipped, to be adored and to be sought, is gold and property. Even those who talk to us of spiritual things and want us to despise wealth show by their example that they adore and worship wealth Some of our noblest teachers and leaders have set an admirable example by deliberate vows of poverty and by giving up the pursuit of wealth in favour of duty and Dharma. My respect for them is profound and genuine. But it pains me to see in the practical elucidation and application of their plans they attach as much importance to wealth, property and capital as any one else does. The fact is that they connot help it. For the successful operation of their schemes and programmes they need money. This they cannot get unless they go to those who have it. These latter then have to be flattered and propitiated. The moment a religious man does this he degrades himself. Unconsciously he gives utterance to lies or half truths, straight or diplomatic, and lends the sanction of his approval to schemes and proceedings which are anything but honourable. He gains his immediate object *viz.*, he gets money for his school, college, orphan asylum, club, society, library or anything of that kind, but he injects an insidious poison into the social body of his people. He praises and advertises men whose method of acquiring wealth he does not approve of, he gives them places of honour, he concedes to them the right of controlling the institution for which he gets their money and so on. He does it with the best of intentions, but what he does has the practical effect of enthroning ill-gotten wealth on the highest pedestal. He may say that it is no part of his business to trace back the sources of money and that he need not go beyond its immediate use and that it is not his business to sit in judgment on those who give him wealth for admittedly fine and worthy objects. In my judgment this is pure sophistry. Our education leads us to look with approval, appreciation and respect on those who are clever though not honest and good, who trample upon the rights of others to amass wealth and obtain position, who use their trained intellect to get the better of those whose intellects are not trained, who make

a perverted use of logic, philosophy, law and language in order to make money and achieve positions of command and wealth. If you will examine the textbooks taught in our schools, if you will look into the souls of our teachers, if you will ascend a little higher and peep into the minds of the officers of the Educational Department, if you will look around you and examine the general atmosphere of respectability pervading society, you will find everywhere and on all sides the supremacy of wealth, property and sophistry. You go through a court of justice and watch the questions and cross-questions put to witnesses and you will find that the respectability of a witness is made to depend upon his wealth and property. Even when we know that a certain wealthy person has made his pile by bribery, flattery, misappropriation, *etc.*, we respect him and hold him up for respect because of the fact of his being wealthy. Now in this matter we are on the horns of a dilemma. We are being ruled by a nation whose God is wealth. In order to save ourselves we have (1) to dam the outgoing flood (2) to use the same methods of making money as have made them rich and (3) to adopt their philosophy of life. In order to win the respect of our rulers we have to adopt certain brands of respectability which they have introduced. Some have commended themselves to our judgment, others we follow and practise just to please them. We cannot help doing so. In the long run there is one idea which haunts us day and night, there is only one test of right and wrong and that is the approval of our rulers. Even when we are not making a bid for their approval, we are dominated by the fear of incurring their displeasure. The springs of our conduct can be traced to (1) the desire of winning the approval and the favour of the rulers, (2) the desire of getting on well and of making money to be rich and respectable (which are practically one and same thing), and (3) the desire of avoiding their displeasure. Anything that is left of our own nature and Dharma comes afterwards. At this stage I wish to guard against being misunderstood. I am not advocating Tyag (renunciation) or Vairag (asceticism). I believe in producing and using wealth but I believe in producing for using (for individual and national purposes) and not for hoarding or profiteering or exploiting or domineering others. This is a subject into a discussion of which I cannot enter at this place.

So far I can see clearly but no further. How to get rid of the existing demoralisation, build up life and society on a true basis of Dharma with substantial justice, social, political and economic to all, I do not yet know. Of one thing, however, I am certain, *viz.*, that you cannot build up a society like that with competition as foundation. What we can do is to preach the gospel of cooperation, to try to put it in practice as far as possible, to start giving right ideas and organising for purposes of co-operation the poorer classes of our countrymen, the peasants and the workers. All classes of people must feel that salvation will come from within, with cooperation, mutual help and mutual trust and not from without, by endlesss, heartless, merciless and soulless competition nor by begging for favour and concessions. This will take us perhaps a very very long time to achieve anything tangible, but nations cannot be built in months. The world currents are directed in that way and they will help us in our cause onward and forward, if we only make up our mind to go ahead not blindly, passively and thoughtlessly, but intelligently, actively and thoughtfully. The problem before us is how to start the work under the existing political and economic organisation of society. What we want to do is to start to do work on these lines without in any way injuring or affecting the existing national activities, and without putting ourselves in conflict with them.

I have my own ideas on this subject which I will develop in another communication some other time.

35. THE PROBLEM OF INDIA

I. THE NATIONAL ASPECT

LET US first be clear about the exact nature of the Indian problem. Political institutions are after all, only a reflection of the national mind and of national conditions. What is the end ? The end is freedom to live according to our own conception of what life should be, to pursue our own ideals, to develop our own civilization and to secure that unity of purpose which would distinguish us from the other nations of the world, insuring for us a position of independence and honour, of security from within and non-interference from without. We have no ambition to conquer and rule other peoples; we have no desire to exploit foreign markets; not even to impose our 'kultur' and our 'civilization' on others. At present we are counted among the backward peoples of the earth mainly because we are a subject people, governed by a foreign power, protected by foreign bayonets and schooled by foreign teachers. The condition of our masses is intellectually deplorable and economically miserable ; our women are still in bondage and do not enjoy the freedom which has been won by their western sisters ; our domestic masters, the prince and priest, are still in saddle ; caste and privilege are still holding sway; yet it is not true that taken all in all we are really a backward people. Even in these matters we find that the difference between us and the 'advanced' nations of the world is one of degree only. Caste and privilege rule in the United States as much as in India. There is nothing in our history which can be put on the same level as the lynching of the Negroes, the lynching of Mr. Little, the deportation of Bisbee miners and other incidents of a similar

Originally published in the *Modern Review*, December 1919. This paper was incorporated with some modifications in Lajpat Rai's *Political Future of India* (New York, 1919).

nature indicative of race hatred and deep-rooted colour prejudice.[1] No nation in the world can claim an idealistic state of society, in which everything is of the best. On the other hand, there are certain matters in which comparison is to our advantage. Even with the advance of drunkenness under British rule we are yet a sober nation; our standards of personal and domestic hygiene are much higher than those of the western people ; our standards of life much simpler and nobler ; our social ideals more humane ; and our spiritual aspirations infinitely superior. As a nation we do not believe in war or militarism or evangelism. We do not force our views on others ; we have more toleration for other people's opinions and beliefs than any other nation in the world has ; we have not yet acquired that craze for possessions and for sheer luxurious and riotous life which marks the modern Pharisees of the West. Our people, according to their conceptions, means and opportunities are kindly, hospitable, gentle, law-abiding, mutually helpful, full of respect for others and peace-loving. It is in fact the existence of these qualities to an abnormal extent that has contributed to our political and economic exploitation by others.

In India capitalism and landlordism have not yet developed to the same extent as they have among the civilized nations of the West. The West is in revolt against capitalism and landlordism. We do not claim that before the advent of the British there was no capitalism or landlordism in India. But we do contend that though there was a certain amount of rivalry and competition between the different castes, within the castes there was much more cooperation and fellow-feeling than there has ever been in the West. Our native governments and their underlings, the landlords, did exact a high price from the village communities for the privilege of cultivating their lands, but within the village there was no *inter se* competition either between the tillers of the soil or between the pursuers of crafts. The gulf between the rich and the poor was not so marked as it is today in the West.

Under the British rule and since its introduction, however, things have considerably changed. Without adopting the best features of modern life, we have been forced by circumstances, political and economic, to give up the best of our own. Village communities have been destroyed ; joint and corporate bargaining has given place to individual transactions ; every bit of land has been

separately measured, marked and taxed; common lands divided ; the price of land has enormously risen and rents have gone up abnormally. The money-lender, who before the advent of British rule, had a comparatively subordinate position in the village community, has suddenly come to occupy the first place. He owns the best lands and the best houses and holds the bodies and souls of the agriculturists in mortgage. The villages which used to be generally homogeneous in population, bound to each other by ties of race, blood and religion, have become heterogeneous, with non-descript people of all kinds, all races and all religions who have acquired land by purchase. Competition has taken the place of cooperation. A country where social cooperation and social solidarity reigned at least within castes, within villages and within urban areas has been entirely disrupted and disintegrated by unlimited and uncontrolled competition.

India never knew any poor laws; she never needed any, nor orphan asylums, nor old age pensions, nor widow homes. She had no use for organized charity. Rarely did any man die for want of food or clothing, except in famines. Hospitality was open and was dispensed under a sense of duty and obligation and not by way of charity or kindness. The survival of the fittest had no hold on our minds. We had no factories or workshops. People worked in their own homes or shops either with their own money or with money borrowed from the money-lender. The artisans were the masters of the goods they produced and unless otherwise agreed with the money-lender, sold them in the open market. The necessities of life, being cheap and easily procurable, the artisan cared more for quality than quantity. Their work was a source of pleasure and pride as well as of profit to them. Now everything has gone, pleasure, pride, as well as profit. Where profit has remained, pleasure and pride are gone.

We are on the high road to a 'distinctly industrial civilization'. In fact the principal complaint of our political reformers and free trade economists is that the British Government has not let us proceed on that road, at a sufficiently rapid pace and that in doing so they have been dominated by their own national interests, more than by our own good. We saw that other nations were progressing by following the laws of industrial development, and quite naturally, we also wanted to prosper by the same method. This

War has opened our eyes as it has opened those of the rest of the world and we have begun to feel that the goal that we were seeking so far led to perdition and not salvation. This makes it necessary for the Indian politicians and economists to review their ideas of political progress. What are we aiming at? Do we want to copy and emulate Europe even in its mistakes and blunders? Does the road to heaven lie through hell? Must we make a wreck of our ship and then try salvage? The civilization of Europe, as it was so far known, is dying. It may take decades or perhaps a century or more to die. But *die it must*. This War has prepared a death-bed for it from which it will never rise. Upon its ruins is rising or will rise another civilization, which will reproduce much of what was valuable and precious in *our own* with much of what we never had. The question that we want to put to our compatriots is, shall we prepare ourselves for the coming era, or shall we bury ourselves in the debris of the expiring one? We have no right to answer it for others, but our answer is clear and unequivocal. We will not be a party to any scheme which shall add to the powers of the capitalist and the landlord and will introduce and accentuate the evils of the expiring industrial civilization into our beloved country.

We are not unaware that according to the judgment of some thinkers, amongst them Karl Marx, a country must pass through the capitalistic mill, before the proletariat comes to its own.[2] We don't believe in the truth of this theory, but even if it be true we will not consciously help in proving it to be true. The existing social order of Europe is vicious and immoral. It is worm-eaten. It has the germs of plague, disease, death and destitution in it. It is in a state of decomposition. It is based on injustice, tyranny, oppression and class rule. Certain phases of it are inherent in our own system. Certain others we are borrowing from our masters, in order to make a complete mess. Wisdom and foresight require that we be forewarned. What we want and what we need, is not the power to implant *in full force* and *in full vigour the expiring* European system, but, power to keep out its further development, with opportunities of undoing the evil that has already been done, gradually and slowly, though assuredly and certainly.

The Government of India as at present constituted is a Government of capitalists and landlords, of both England and India.

Under the proposed Reform Scheme[3] the power of the former will be reduced and that of the latter increased. The Indo-British Association does not like it, not because it loves the masses of India, for which it hypocritically and insincerely professes solicitude, but because in their judgment it reduces the profits of the British governing classes. We doubt if the Scheme really does effect even that. But if it does, it is good so far.

The ugly feature of the Sheme is not its potentiality in transferring the power into the hands of the Brahmans (the power of the Brahmans as such, is gone for good), but in the possibility of its giving too much power to the "profiteering" class. The Scheme protects the European merchants, it confers special privileges on the small European community, it provides special representation for the landlords, the Chambers of Commerce, the Mohammedans and the Sikhs. What is left for the general tax-paying public is precious little. The authors of the Scheme say it is in the interest of the general masses, the poor, inarticulate ryot and the workingman that they would not give complete Home Rule at once. We wish we could believe in it. We wish it were true. Perhaps they mean it but our past experience does not justify our accepting it at its face value.

There is, however, one thing we can do. We can ask them for proofs by insisting on and agitating for the immediate legislative relief of the ryot and the middle classes. We should adopt the aims of the British Labour Party as our own, start educating our people on those lines and formulate measures which will secure for them *real freedom*, and not the counterfeit coin which passes for it. It will require years of education and agitation but it has to be done, no matter whether we are ruled by the British or by our own property-holders. We are not opposed to Home Rule. Nay, we press for it. In our judgment the objections urged for not giving it at once are flimsy and intangible. The chief obstacles are such as have been created or perpetuated by the British themselves. Caste does not prevent us from having as much Home Rule as is enjoyed by the people of Italy, Hungary, the Balkan States and some of the South American Republics. But if we cannot have it at once and if the British must retain the power of final decision in their hands, we must insist upon something being immediately done not only to educate the ryot but to give him economic relief. So long as the

British continue to refuse to do that, we must hold them responsible for all the misery that Indian humanity is suffering from.

We want political power in order to raise the intellectual and political status of our masses. We do not want to bolster up the classes. Our goal is real liberty, equality and opportunity for all. We want to avoid, if possible, the evils of the class struggle. We will pass through the mill, if we have to, but we should like to try to avoid it, and it is for that purpose that we want freedom to legislate and freedom to determine our fiscal arrangements. That is our main purpose in our demand for Home Rule.

II. The International Aspect

We have so far discussed the Indian question from the internal or national point of view. But it has an international aspect also. It is said, and we hope it is true, that the world is entering into an era of new internationalism and that the old exclusive chauvinistic nationalism is in its last gasps. This War was the greatest social mix-up known to history. It has brought about the downfall of four monarchs and the destruction of four empires. The armies of the belligerents on both sides contained the greatest assortment of races and nations, of religions and languages that were ever brought together for mutual destruction. Primarily, a fight between the European Christians, it drew forth into its arena Hindus, Mohammedans, Buddhists, Shintos, Jews and Negroes of Africa and America.

The War has produced a revolution in Russia, the like of which was never known before. It is now being openly said that the Russian revolution had as much influence on the final *debacle* of the Central Powers as the strength of the Allies and the resources of America. The Revolution has spread to Germany and Austria and threatens to engulf the whole of Europe. It has given birth to a new order of society aglow with the spirit of a new and elevated kind of internationalism. This internationalism must have for its foundation justice and self-determination for all peoples, regardless of race or religion, creed or colour. The new international link between different nations must be supplied by cooperation, as against competition, and by mutual trust and helpfulness, in place of distrust and exploitation of the weaker by the stronger The only other alternatives are reaction, with the certainty of even greater

wars in the near future, and Bolshevism.

Now nobody knows what Bolshevism represents. The Socialists themselves are divided over it. The advanced wing is enthusiastic ; the moderates are denouncing it. The Liberals and Radicals are freely recognising that it has brought about a new spirit into the affairs of men, which is going to stay and substantially influence the future of the world. The stand-patters denounce it in the strongest possible terms. They represent and calumniate it to their heart's content, call it by all sorts of names and are moving heaven and earth to exterminate it. But we feel that only radical changes in the existing order will stem its tide. The Socialists and Radicals want to make the most of it, while the Imperialist Liberals and Conservatives want to give as little as is compatible with the safety of the existing order in which they are supreme. The struggle will take some time to end, but that it shall end in favour of the new spirit no one doubts.

The only way to meet Bolshevism is to concede to the different peoples of the earth, now being bled and exploited, their rights. Otherwise the discontented and exploited countries of the earth will be the best breeding centres for it. India must come into its own soon or else not even the Himalayas can effectually bar the entry of Bolshevism into India. A contented, self-governed India may be proof against it ; a discontented, dissatisfied, oppressed India would perhaps offer the most fertile field We hope the British statesmen are alive to the situation.

But that is not the only way to look at the international importance of India. By its geographical situation, it is the connecting link between the Near East and the Far East, and the clearing house for the trade of the world. Racially, it holds the balance between the European Aryans and the yellow races. In any military conflict between the white and the yellow races, the people of India will be a decisive factor. In a conflict of peace they will be a harmonising element. Racially, they are the kind of the Europeans. By religion and culture they are nearer the Chinese and Japanese.

With seventy million Muslims, India is the most important centre of Mohammedan sentiment. With Christians as their present rulers the Hindus and Mohammedans of India are coming to realise

that their best interests require a closing up of their ranks. There is no doubt that, come what may, their relations in future will be much more cordial, friendly and mutually sympathetic than they have been in the past. The Hindus will stand by their Mohammedan countrymen in all their efforts to revive the glory of Islam, and to regain for it political independence. There is no fear of a Pan-Islamic movement, if the new spirit of internationalism prevails. If, however, it does not, the Pan-Islamic movement might find a sympathetic soul in India. Islam is not dead. It cannot and will not die. The only way to make it a force of harmony and peace is to recognise its potentialities and to respect its susceptibilities. The political independence of Islamic countries is the basic foundation for such a state. We hope that the statesmen of the world will give their most earnest thought to the question and sincerely put into practice the principles they have been enunciating during the War. The case of India will be an acid test.

A happy India will make a valuable contribution to the evolution of a better and more improved humanity. An unhappy India will be a clog in the wheels of progress. It will not be easy for the masters of India to rule it on the old lines. If not reconciled, it might prove the pivot of the next war. A happy India will be one of the brightest spots in the British Commonwealth. A discontented India will be a cause of standing shame and a source of never-ending trouble.

With a republican China in the north-east, a constitutional Persia in the north-west and a Bolshevist Russia in the not remote north, it will be extremely foolish to attempt to rule India despotically. Not even the gods can do it. It is not possible even if the legislature devotes all its sittings to the drafting and passing of one hundred coercion acts. The peace of the world, international harmony, and goodwill, the good name of the British Commonwealth, the safety of the Empire as such, demand the peaceful introduction and development of democracy in India.

The following remark of the *New York Tribune* deserves the best consideration of the British statesmen:

"It is an impressive, and, we might say, a somewhat startling reflection that two of the greatest members of the freest and most enlightened empire of the world are practically the only two countries

in the world still governed by irresponsible autocracy. Even Russia and China have become at least theoretical democracies. Germany is at this moment organizing a republic, and Persia and Turkey profess to be constitutional monarchies; while India and Egypt alone remain under administrations not accountable to the people. That is of course not to say that they are not governed for the benefit of the people. We believe that they are, to a much greater extent than some countries which have nominally democratic governments. But that is not sufficient. Your benevolent despotism may be the best possible government; so long as your despot remains benevolent. But you have no assurance of any such perseverance of the saints."

Supreme wisdom was expressed in Lincoln's formula. The people were to be governed, not merely for the people, but also by the people, and not merely by the people, but also for the people.

36. NATIONAL EDUCATION

THE INDIAN papers to hand report that our publicists are engaged in a discussion of the question of "national education" for India, The movement is led by some of the sincerest and most devoted leaders of the nationalist movement for Home Rule for India, and appears to be spreading. From the stray papers that I have received, I have not been able to find out the exact position of those who are reported to have struck a note of mild dissent, more by way of criticism than of opposition, but they give some idea of the position of those who are supporting it. Mrs. Besant has kindly mentioned my name as one of those who pioneered the movement in the Punjab in the eighties of the last century.

It is quite true that I am one of those persons who raised the cry of "national education" in North India, so far back as 1883 A. D., and have since then used it rather effectively for enlisting sympathy and collecting funds for the various institutions that were from time to time started to impart education on 'national' lines. It is also obvious that the 'nationalism' that we preached in those days was rather narrow and sectarian. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was the first among the Indian leaders of thought in North India, who set afloat the idea of denominational education. The Christian institutions had led the way before him. The Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh was a symbol of the new Muslim Nationalism which (Sir) Syed Ahmed Khan founded, educational in function, but political in scope and effect.[1]

The Arya Samaj, representing the new nationalism of the Hindus, followed suit and the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, at Lahore, was the fruit of its efforts.[2] Then came the movement

Originally published in *The Modern Review*, March and April, 1919.

of the Central Hindu College at Benares, upon which has now been erected the superstructure of the Hindu University[3]. The Mohammedan College at Aligarh, the Arya Samaj College at Lahore, the Hindu College at Benares, all embodied the "national" ideals of their founders, limited and sectarian as they were, at the time. Each professed to provide its own kind of national education. The educational facilities provided by these institutions were open to persons of all creeds, denominations and religions, but the nationalism aimed at was undisguisedly denominational. Each institution created an atmosphere of its own-national to a certain extent, so far as the general cult of love of mother-country was concerned but otherwise openly sectarian.

The education imparted in these institutions, as distinguished from the ordinary state-owned schools and colleges, was "national" only in so far as it helped the creation of the denominational atmosphere aimed at by its promulgators. The Muslim College and the Hindu Colleges all professed to enforce and encourage the study of the vernaculars and their sacred languages, but the emphasis all the time was on the University course and the University examinations. The scheme of studies promulgated by Official Universities was accepted unreservedly, except in the additions that were made to the courses in Hindi and Urdu, Sanskrit and Arabic. The principal business of the staffs engaged was to prepare students for University examinations. The results achieved in these examinations were the measure of their success and popularity. In the two Colleges in the United Provinces, the leading positions on the staff were reserved for Europeans. Special efforts were no doubt made in each institution to inoculate the students with the serum of that narrow nationalism which had inspired its founders. Subscriptions were raised and endowments made for the dissemination of religon, for the encouragement of the study of Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian. Some attempts were also made to encourage original research in the literatures and records that existed in these languages, with a view to prop up the several interpretations that the founders and the managers put upon their respective religions and their histories; but the success achieved in this line was, in each case, dubious and almost imperceptible.

I can speak more definitely of the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic

College, at Lahore, with the management of which I was intimately associated for about a quarter of the century. For over nine years I was the general secretary of the governing body, and for several years its Vice-President. I hope I shall not be charged with vanity if I say that for twenty-five years I gave the best in me to the institution—grudged neither time nor money, nor energy in doing all that I could to ensure its success and progress. My duties were by no means confined to field and office work (running the office, addressing public meetings, collecting funds, raising subscriptions, doing publicity work, conducting and writing for periodicals, etc.), but included close association with the staff and the students and the supervision of the different departments, particularly the boarding houses.

It is with immense pleasure and pride that I look back upon that period of my life. It was a rare privilege to associate and cooperate with men of the character and calibre of Hans Raj, Lal Chand, Dwarka Dass, Ishwar Dass, and others, too numerous to be mentioned here.[4] Their spirit was denominational and sectarian no doubt, but there was hardly anything of meanness or pettiness, or jealousy in it. Even their sectarianism was of an exalted kind, the country—the Motherland—had always the uppermost place in their affections. They were all inspired by a spirit of genuine and disinterested patriotism and altruism. Their methods were clean and above board. It was a joy to work with them.

Of all the schemes of national education promulgated till then, theirs was probably the first which took cognizance of the economic problem. They are probably the first to include in their educational programme the idea of "Swadeshi". The original prospectus of the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College was remarkable for these things : (a) the emphasis it laid in bridging the gulf between the educated classes and the uneducated masses ; (b) in emphasizing the necessity of technical education in arts and industries, which would make the future leaders of the country, independent of State service ; and (c) in insisting that their scheme of national education should be absolutely independent of Government patronage and Government help.

Looking back on the record of the institution for the last

thirty-two years of its life, giving all possible credit to the founders and the managers and the leaders thereof, for the best of intentions, the best of efforts and the best of everything, I regret to say that failure in their principal aims, written and unwritten, is writ large on it. Let me guard against misunderstanding. There is no man in India for whom I have greater respect than Hans Raj, the Founder-president of the Arya College, nor another body of men in the whole country towards whom I entertain feelings of greater respect, regard, and reverence than the past and present managers of the Dayanand College. The spirit of self-sacrifice and national service shown by Hans Raj and his pupils, is almost unique, and worthy of the highest praise. The work done by them deserves all credit. The tiny bark of high education in the Punjab was rescued by this College at the time of its greatest danger. The spirit of public service in the land of the five rivers owes an immeasurable debt to the little band of workers who brought the College into existence and have run it since. Considering the positions and the resources of the men who conceived the idea and worked hard to make it a success, considering the general air of all-round suspicion and distrust in which they lived and worked, the history of the financial and educational success of the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, Lahore, is nothing short of a romance.

The Muslim College at Aligarh, and the Hiudu College at Benares, were both started under better auspices, blessed with smiles of the leading aristocracy of their respective communities, and with the goodwill of the ruling authorities. The Arya College had none of these advantages. It was founded, managed, and run for a long time in defiance of both. Every brick of this institution has a story of its own, which, perhaps, will never see the light of day. These stories have already been forgotten and the few that are current will be burned with the bodies of those who composed them, not in words, but in deeds. Yes, all this is true ; it is a pleasure and a privilege to be able to say this. Yet it must be owned that in solving the problems of national education, the Arya College at Lahore has been as conspicuous a failure as the other institutions started with similar objects in other parts of the country. Prior to the foundation of the National College in Bengal[6], the

Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, at Lahore, was the only institution in the country which could even by a stretch of imagination and language, lay any claim to being called "national" in the sense in which the word was understood then. The Fergusson College is named after a foreigner, and with the exception of the spirit of self-sacrifice of its founder, directors and teachers, had no other claim to be distinguished from the ordinary State Colleges[6]. The Aligarh College and the Benares College both have had all the time foreigners on their staffs, and have, besides in conjunction with the Fergusson College at Poona, been almost regularly in receipt of State aid, thus subjecting practically the whole of their policy to Government control. Not that that fact necessarily makes them denationalised, but that it reduces their claim to any great distinction from the ordinary State-managed institutions.

Besides the institutions mentioned above, there are some others also which claim to impart national education and which have been founded for that purpose. One of them is the Gurukula academy at Hardwar, founded by Lala Munshi Ram and his party[7]. The Gurukula, too, is a sectarian institution. Otherwise it certainly has a greater claim to being "national" than any of the others mentioned previously. It is an institution founded, managed, staffed, and financed by Indians only. In its curriculum it gives the first place to Indian languages. It is more in conformity with the spirit of Hinduism than the College at Lahore, or the Central Hindu College at Benares. It takes no notice of the official University courses or the University examinations. It enforces a discipline which is more truly national than any thing done in the other institutions. All that has been said about the spirit of self-sacrifice of those who founded the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College is applicable to it in its entirety. Yet I am afraid it is no more national than any of the others.

Another institution of almost the same kind is the Tagore School at Bolpur[8]. It does not profess to impart high education, and is a one-man institution. There may be some other institutions which claim to provide national education, with whose origin and history I am not acquainted. If so, I beg to be pardoned for not noticing them. It is not my purpose to give a complete list of "national" schools and colleges. The object is to notice some

typical efforts and make a retrospective review.

The only effort of this kind which was, in my judgment, truly national, was that made by the National Council of Education in Bengal, under the impetus of the Swadeshi and the Boycott movements. The scheme of the National Council was free from the sectarian tinge of the Upper India movements ; it took no notice of denominational nationalism ; it took ample cognizance of the economic needs of the country as a whole, and it frankly recognised the necessity of ignoring the official University curriculum, on the one hand, and the State aid on the other. It aimed at national consolidation and national independence. It was a direct challenge to the Government and the Government accepted it whole-heartedly. What came of it is known to everybody and need not be stated here. It failed as it was bound to do, because it came into conflict with the State,—not, of course, of its own seeking[9].

The National Council of Education still exists, but only in name. Its condition is moribund. The leaders and officers themselves have strangulated it. Taraknath Palit and Rash Behari Ghosh, two of its greatest pillars, gave it a death blow when they handed over their magnificient endowments to the Calcutta University, instead of to the National Council of Education, founded and led by them. The few scholars who, with characteristic self-sacrifice, gave up careers to give instruction to the students of the National College, are almost all dispersed. They are seeking appointments in Government and aided institutions. The Nationalist Schools, started by the Council, have (most of them) been disintegrated by the force of circumstances, and at the present moment the movement is nothing but a dilapidated and discarded landmark in the educational progress of the country.

The only institutions that are still in existence and prospering are the denominational ones. The D. A. V. College at Lahore and M.A.O. College at Aligarh are thriving and a source of joy to their founders. They follow the policy of least, or no resistance. The D.A.V. College, which was under suspicion ever since its birth, has more or less gained the confidence of the rulers by a radical change in its policy, and the reins of the Mohammedan College at Aligarh are held tightly by the Government. The Benares College is an independent University which enjoys both the confidence and the

control of the Government. The Gurukula at Kangri is virtually the only institution that is independent of Government control. It was under a cloud for a long time, until Sir James Meston and Lord Hardinge put upon it the seal of their approbation.[10] I think the same might be said of Tagore's School at Bolpur.

Now I do not mean to insinuate even by implication that these institutions have not been educationally useful to the nation, or that their managers or leaders were not actuated by the best of motives. The remarks that I have made above about the Arya Samaj institutions apply with equal force to almost all the institutions. They are, without exception, monuments of the partiotism and public spirit of their founders and managers, and far be it from me to make any reflection on them.

Yet I cannot help repeating once more, that they have not except by their failure, made any substantial contribution towards the solution of the problem of "national education." I want the leaders of the new movement to realise that fully, and to keep it in mind in formulating their new scheme. I, for one, do not believe in living in a fool's paradise. The first thing is to clear our minds of cant, and have a clear conception of what we mean by national education.

II

I have before me three pronouncements on "national education"; one by Mrs. Annie Besant, the other by Mr. B.G. Tilak, and the third by Sir Rash Behari Ghosh. Of these, Mrs. Besant's is perhaps the only one which embodies ideas on the subject. I say this without any disrespect to the others. I will, therefore, consider that one first. Says Mrs. Besant :

"Nothing can more swiftly emasculate national life, nothing can more surely weaken national character, than allowing the education of the young to be controlled by foreign influences, to be dominated by foreign ideals. From 1896, onwards, I have ventured to urge on the Indian people that the education which was given to their sons was denationalising and despiritualising; foreign habits, foreign manners, foreign dress, foreign ways are all enforced in a foreign language, with, in missionary schools, a foreign religion to boot, sterilising the boy's heart, and despiritualising his whole nature. Is it any wonder that the national spirit decayed, until a vigorous effort was made to capture education by Munshi Ram, Hans Raj

(and others mentioned in article I) ?"

Coming to the constructive side of the problem, Mrs. Besant propounds the question "what must our national education be", and then answers it in the following terms:

"1. It must be controlled by Indians, shaped by Indians, carried on by Indians. It must hold up Indian ideals of devotion, wisdom, and morality, and must be permeated by the Indian religious spirit rather than fed on the letter of the creeds. That spirit is spacious, tolerant, all-embracing, and recognises that man goes to God along many roads and that all the prophets came from him.

"2. National education must live in an atmosphere of proud and glowing patriotism, and this atmosphere must be kept sweet, fresh, and bracing by the study of Indian literature, Indian history, Indian triumphs in science, in art, in politics, in war, in colonisation, in manufactures, in trade, in commerce. The Arthashastra must be studied as well as the Dharmashastra, science and politics as well as religion.

"3. National education must not be separated from the homes of the nation. The ideals, the interests, the principles, the emotions of the one must be those of the other. For the nation is built out of families, and the present opposition between the home and the school must cease. The teachers in school and college must work in harmony with the teachers in the home.

"4. National education must meet the national temperament at every point, and develop the national character. India is not to become a lesser—nor even a greater—England, but to evolve into a mightier India. British ideals are good for Britain, but it is India's ideals that are good for India. We do not want echoes nor monotones; we want a choral melody of nations, mirroring the varied qualities of Nature and of God. Shall nature show but a single colour, and trees and flowers, and mountains, and sky wear but a single hue ? Harmonious variety and not monotony is the mark of perfection.

"Away from all apologies for India, with all deprecatory explanations of India's ways and customs, and traditions, India is herself, and needs not to be justified; for verily, God has evolved no greater, no more exquisite nationality than India's among all the broken reflections of His own perfect beauty."

The language of this pronouncement is dear to the heart of every nationalist. It is spirited and stimulating as well as ennobling and encouraging. As a piece of rhetoric, it is exquisite. I have often used similar language, and with good results. I may use it again if occasion demands it. We Indians owe a great debt of gratitude to Mrs. Besant for her activities in connection with the Theosophical Society and the Central Hindu College at Benares. Our obligations to her have grown immensely, both in volume and intensity by her lead and interest in the Home Rule Movement. Consequently, anything that comes from her must receive our careful and respectful consideration. Yet these facts make it all the more incumbent upon us not to hesitate to say "we differ", when, after a careful and respectful consideration, we do differ from her. I am certain that she does not want us to follow her blindly. She lays no claim to infallibility.

Indian publicists have a duty to perform. They are planning the future of their nation, which is at the present moment in a state of transition and is undergoing a process of transformation. So much depends on education.

Education is the most vital question for us. It is most important of all our problems. In a way it is the fundamental problem. We cannot afford to have loose and confused ideas about education, the aims and ends of education, and the methods of education. Our whole future hangs on it. It behoves us, therefore, to devote all the mental energy, which we possess, to the right understanding and the right solution thereof. It would not do to be carried away by prejudices and mere sentimentality. The decision must be arrived at by deep, careful and critical consideration of the whole question. A hastily arrived at decision, or one that is founded on prejudice and sentimentality, may materially hinder our progress or, at any rate, slow down the rate of progress.

The national mind is just now in a fluid condition. It needs wise and thoughtful guidance. Like wax, it will take such impressions as those, whom the people love and respect and in whose wise leadership they have confidence, decide to give. Tendencies created, prejudices reared, sentiments disseminated, when they go deep into the psychology of the nation, are difficult to uproot. To create national tendencies, sentiments, prejudices, impressions and preferments in haste, under the idea that they can be corrected later,

when found to be wrong, involves so much waste of energy and opportunity that no wise leader ought to do it light-heartedly. This essay is only a plea for careful, critical consideration, as well as broad, thoughtful planning. There is no intention to indulge in petty or destructive criticism, nor to pose as an oracle.

III

Firstly, we should come to a clear understanding of what our national ideals are. Do we want to be an integral part of the "civilized world", making our contribution to its progress, by thought and action, or do we want to be an isolated national unit, happy in our retirement and liberty, economic independence, social solidarity and religious freedom, but for what ends? If so what is that end?

Some will say that salvation is the ultimate end we desire. But what is meant by salvation"? Is it the Nirvana of Buddhism, the merging of the individual soul in the supreme soul of the Vedanta, the temporary bliss of the Arya Samaj, the Mukti of the Christian, or the Paradise of the orthodox Muslim? Or are these after all only delusions? The real salvation lies in freedom from misery, poverty, disease, ignorance and slavery of every kind, in this life, now and hereafter for our successors. There are religions which enjoin on their followers the duty of suffering all the pangs of misery, poverty, disease, ignorance and slavery, in order to have the certainty of bliss and happiness hereafter in the life to come. In fact, this is more or less the tendency of all religions which have been systematised.

From the earnestness, which all classes of Indians are displaying in fighting out misery, poverty, disease, ignorance and slavery, it appears that they have made up their minds on one question at least, whatever be the ultimate salvation, Mukti or Nijat or Nirvana. Our people do not want misery, poverty, disease, ignorance and slavery either for themselves or for their children. Hindus (Santanists, Arya Samajists, Brahmo Samajists, Vedantists and others), Muslims, Christians, all are agreed on this point. Everyone is trying to explain his own dogma or creed, in such a way as to make a pursuit of happiness in this world by the righteous acquisition of wealth and health and knowledge, a desirable end. The natural bent of the human mind is also in the same direction. But

priests, prophets and reformers are not dead, nor do they show any signs of death. They are just hiding their heads and biding their time. With the least encouragement and stimulus they come out into the open and start their poisonous propaganda.

Vairagya, a life of renunciation and poverty, is still the ostensible goal of every religion. Sanyasis, Dervishes and monks are still our ideals among men. Even the most rational and liberal minded reformer respects and reveres them—men of religion we call them, and hence our instinctive, impulsive, deep-rooted sentiment in their favour. What is worse is that some modern educated men, who are neither priests nor monks, and who in most cases do not themselves lead a life of asceticism, are holding up the same ideal for their younger countrymen.

Every religion contains some beautiful and sublime principles which save its followers from utter annihilation in the struggle for life, be it individual or social, but the bulk of every religion's teaching and its literature, as ordinarily understood, lays emphasis on the negation of life, as distinguished from its assertion and intensification.

Higher Hindu religion teaches that salvation lies in Gnan (knowledge), not mere knowledge, but realised knowledge. It insists that those who aspire to this kind of knowledge must live a full life, albeit and controlled life, before they can acquire that kind of Gnan. They must do their full duty to society and learn all that has to be learnt by social amenities, relations and sensations. Then they can renounce certain phases of life, in favour of certain others. A vow of poverty did not in ancient times involve an exaltation of poverty over wealth, but only freedom from the obligations of property at a certain stage of one's life. In fact the most ancient literature of the Hindus makes no mention except by far-fetched implication of Sanyasis. All the great Rishis and Munis of the past had property, as well as families. They preferred to live away from crowds only for purposes of research, for Yoga Samadhi, and concentration of mind on the problems of life. That condition was not an end in itself, but a social means for a social end.

It was not a desire of Mukti alone that led them to do it, but the very social and admirable desire of helping humanity by a rational solution of the problems of life. Look how this ideal

was degraded in later times, until we came to exalt a life of mere Tyag (renunciation) as such, and to place it at the top of life's edifice, as a goal, an end and a lighthouse. It is true the whole nation never practised it, but that was because it was impossible to do so. As many people as wished to adopt it, did adopt it, until we find that today a good part of the nation having abandoned all productive economic work, engages itself in preaching the virtues of Sadhuism, and, in making the people believe that next to becoming a Sadhu himself, the best thing for a man to do to avoid damnation is to feed and maintain Sadhus.

I am afraid what I have said of Hinduism is also more or less true of Mohammedanism and Christianity. So deep-rooted is the sentiment, that even iconoclastic reforming agencies like the Arya Samaj, the Brahmo Samaj and the Vivekananda Mission among the Hindus so often drift in the same direction. Their hymns and songs and prayers are still brimful of that spirit. At the time when English education began to be imparted in India, this fatal tendency towards negation of life was a substantial part of our national character. We may defend our respective religions against the charge of having actively taught this negation as an ideal but we cannot with any honesly deny the fact of the prevalance of this spirit to an alarming extent among our people. Nor can we conceal that more or less the whole of our literature breathes this tendency. We may call it an addition of degenerate times, but there it is. No one reading that literature can evade the subtle influence of this tendecy which pervades it. Our epics are the most human documents we possess. Yet, even they are full of that spirit.

Now it must be owned that the present awakening, the protest against this tendency, owes its birth to foreign education, however godless it may have been. Sometimes I feel thankful for its being godless. But for this education there may have been no awakening or, to be more accurate, the awakening might have been indefinitely delayed. To my mind the first need of India is the absolute destruction of this tendency. This tendency is the fundamental basis of all our national weaknesses. Christianity, too, has that tendency and if the Christian nations had stuck to true Christianity, they would have made no progress at all. It is not Christianity that has produced the modern improvements in life. Progress in Europe has been made

in spite of Christianity. The most important work before us, then, is to change the general psychology of our people in this respect, to create in them an interest, a zest in real life.

The general prevailing idea of life in India is that of a necessary evil. That life itself is a misery, and a misfortune from which it is desirable to escape is so deeply written on the souls of our people, that it is not easy to efface it. What India needs is an earnest, widely spread, persistent effort to teach and preach the gospel of life. That life is real, precious, earnest, invaluable to be prized, preserved, prolonged and enjoyed, is not so obvious to our people as it should be. Not that the Indians do not value living; not that they have no respect for life as such, nay in fact some of them care for mere life, so much as to preserve inferior lives even at the sacrifice or the detriment of human life. The vast bulk of them prefer mere living to honourable living.

The ancient Hindus seem to have had a clear idea of the amount of energy that had been expended by the race in the evolution of man. The idea is so deep-rooted that every Hindu rustic will tell you what a privilege it is to be born a human being. So far he is all right. The trouble begins when he starts to consider the aim of life. As to that he is being told, day in and day out, that supreme merit lies in killing desire, in escaping from the life of senses so as to escape from the pain of rebirth. This necessarily leads him to shun life, to belittle it, and eventually to escape from it, if he can. I admit that this is a perversion of the original doctrine, and that there is not sufficient sanction for it in the ancient scriptures, but then that is the prevailing belief which finds ample support and justification from the language of the sacred books. The first aim of a national system of education should be to destroy this belief. This cannot be achieved by a promulgation and perpetuation of that literature in its present form, which is over-full of this false view of life's aim. Personally I have a great affection for the Sanskrit language and the literature contained in it, but in my judgment any attempt, to make it a medium of general education and uplift is bound to fail and deserves to fail.

Its value for the purposes of historical research is obvious. Its aid to enrich the vocabulary of our vernaculars is indispensable. Its cultivation for purposes of scholarship may be assured but its use for

the practical purposes of life to the ordinary citizen is more than problematic.

Arabic and Persian are more advantageously placed in this respect than Sanskrit. Both of them are living languages, still spoken by whole populations of men, though of course, their modern forms are considerably different from the ancient ones. Sanskrit occupies the same position in India, which Greek and Latin occupy in Europe. Sensible Europe is dropping the study of the latter, except for the limited few who aspire to a career of literature, and India will have to do the same if she wants her children to employ their time and energy in the solution of the practical problems of life.

The attempt to live in the past is not only futile but even foolish; what we need to take care of is the future. If India of the future is to live a full, healthy and vigorous life commensurate with the importance which belongs to it, by virtue of its human and other resources, it must come into more close touch with the rest of the world. If it is to occupy its rightful place among the nations of the globe, it must make the most profitable and the most effective use of its intellectual, mental and general human potentialities.

Sanskrit is a perfect language, having a great record of valuable literature, and so are Latin and Greek. They are all sisters. Just as Europe and America are discovering that for the ordinary boy not aiming to devote his life to literary or historical research, the study of Greek and Latin may be profitably displaced by the study of the other modern languages, so will the Hindus have to do.

That intelligent Hindus already realize that, is proved by their conduct. My personal experiences (of the last 36 years in connection with the D A.V.College) justify my saying that of all those who founded the D.A.V. College and afterwards nursed it with energy and devotion there were and are only a few who ever wanted their own children to follow the courses of Sanskrit which they prescribed for others. Of these, perhaps there are still fewer, whose sons are using their knowledge of Sanskrit for any effective purpose. Some of them have given up all study of Sanskrit and consider the time spent in acquiring it as lost. Of all those pious donors, who make endowments for popularising the study of Sanskrit or for imparting religious instruction in creeds and forms, there are very few who make

their own sons and nephews devote much of their time to either.

Personally I yield to none in my respect for the ancient Aryans. I am as proud as any one else of their achievements. They advanced human knowledge to an extent that has made it possible for the moderns to advance. I am proud of their wisdom, their spirituality, their ethics and their literary achievements, but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that in knowledge the world has since then advanced much further. And if knowledge is wisdom, then we must presume also that the world is wiser today than it was 3,000 years ago.

That advanced knowledge and its resultant wisdom is at present embodied in foreign languages. Every year, every month, nay every day in the year, it is making further progress. So much so that a book dealing with sciences becomes almost out of date within a year, unless a new edition is produced with up-to-date improvements. No one who does not want to fall behind, can afford to neglect these sciences, which can only be studied effectively for a number of years, at least, in these foreign languages.

Besides, it should not be forgotten that modern scientific inventions, including the use of steam and electricity for transportation purposes have destroyed the barriers of space and distance. No nation, however ideal in its desires and ambitions, however spiritually inclined in its standards and values of life can live a life of isolation, even if she desired to do so. Intercourse with other nations for purposes of trade and commerce is no longer optional. It is compulsory. If India's trade and commerce is to be carried on by Indians, and not by foreigners, and if the Indian people are to profit therefrom, it is necessary that our traders and commercial men should know as many modern languages as may be possible for them to acquire first in school, and then out of it. The bulk of the nation must be engaged in agriculture, or manufacture or business. For all these purposes a knowledge of the modern languages is almost a necessity. Under these circumstances to compel boys to devote a greater part of their school time preparatory to entering life, in studying a complicated difficult ancient language like Sanskrit is such a flagrant misuse of energy that it is bound to harm the general efficiency of the nation if we persist in that course. So, it is high time that the nation should make up its mind that like other luxuries the study of Sanskrit is for the few and not for the many. Sanskrit

must be studied by the few for the purpose of research and culture, and for helping the nation in enriching the vocabulary of the vernaculars. For the many the study of foreign modern languages must be insisted on, accompanied by a good knowledge of the modern languages of India. I intend to say something more on this subject later. At present I am making these remarks only to clear the ground for the consideration of what would be the aim and scope of any national system of education for India.

Descending from national literature to national methods of education, I must say at once that it will be a folly to revive the latter. They are out of date, and antiquated. To adopt them will be a step backward and not forward.

The present school system is atrocious, and there is no doubt that the ancient system was in certain respects (mark, in certain respects only) much better. The system actually followed at the time of the introduction of British rule, had lost the best features of the more ancient one. We are mighty glad, that the system then prevalent was rejected in favour of the Western school system. The emasculation which has resulted from the latter, would have been greater and much worse, if the former had received the sanction of the State and been adopted.

The subject is so vast and complicated, that it is impossible to discuss it at any length here, but one cannot make himself fully intelligible without making some more observations on the point.

The ancient system which emphasised the personal relationship of the Guru and the Chela, was good in certain respects and harmful in others. The personal relationship supplied the human element which is now missing. This was a guarantee of greater attention being paid to the formation of habits which compose character. On the other hand it had a tendency of enslaving the pupils' mind. The aim of education should be to qualify the educated to think and act for himself with a due sense of responsibility towards society. Did the Gurukula system achieve this ? In my judgment, it could not. The very oath administered to the Brahmchari and the benediction administered by the Guru, if properly analysed, will show that the ideal was to reproduce the Guru in the person of the Chela. The aim of every parent and every teacher should be to enable their children and pupils, to be greater and

better persons, than mere copies of themselves. I shall be glad to be corrected if I am mistaken in this belief. The discipline enforced was too strict, too mechanical and too empirical. The religion taught was too formal, rigid and narrow. A disproportionate amount of time was devoted to the memorizing of rules of grammar and texts. It seems that the relations between the teacher and pupil were possibly freer in the time of the Upanishads than in the period of the Codes. The system inculcated in the Codes is a system of iron and fire.

It was not peculiar to India. The Arabs, the Hindus and the Latins also had similar systems.

The fact that in spite of these drawbacks, the Hindus, the Greeks, the Romans, the Arabs and the Catholic Christian institutions of medieval Europe produced so many scholars, philosophers and jurists is in no way proof of their excellence. It only establishes the capacity of the human mind to transcend its environments and to rise above the limitations imposed on it by authority, be the authority that of the parent, the Guru or the State.

The Gurukula academy at Hardwar has attempted to remove some of these defects, but I am not quite sure that the segregation insisted on in that institution was ever so complete in the ancient times as it is represented to be. The name implies, that the pupil lived with his Guru as an adopted member of the latter's family. In every way he was treated as a child of the family. In that case, the number that each Guru could take must have been extremely limited. There must have been larger Ashrams and Parishads too, where a number of Gurus co-operated in teaching and training large numbers of pupils, but whether these Ashramas and Parishads insisted on the pupils being so completely cut away from the society in general is problematic. At any rate the pupils had daily opportunities to see and talk to women, when they went for Bhiksha (alms).

I am extremely doubtful if the system of education advocated in the Colleges, was ever followed universally. I have reason to think, that it was mainly devised for the children of the Brahmans. However, be that as it may, I have no doubt that it is impossible to be re-introduced as a part of the general scheme of education in India of today. I am also positive that it is detrimental to the sort of character we want to develop, nay we

must develop in our boys and girls, if we are to keep pace with the rest of the world, in their march onward. Our boys and girls must not be brought up in hot-houses. They should be brought up in the midst of the society of which they are to be members. They should form habits and learn every emergency. They should learn to rise above temptations and not shun them. The world is a "temptation". It is a place to enjoy, so long as by doing so, one does not injure oneself and others. So long one is loyal to the society in which his lot has been cast and towards which he has social obligations, one commits no sin, by taking to the pleasures of life in a moderate degree.

Boys and girls must learn their social obligations, when in their teens. To segregate them at such a time is to deprive them of the greatest and the best opportunity of their lives. The idea of having schools and colleges and Universities in localities far away from the bustle of city life and from the temptations incidental to it, is an old idea which is being abandoned by the best educational thinkers of the world. The new idea is to let the boys and girls be surrounded by the conditions of life in which they have to move and which they have to meet in after life. To let boys and girls grow in isolation, ignorant of the conditions of actual life, innocent of the social amenities of life, with no experience of the sudden demands and emergencies of group life is to deprive them of the most valuable element in their education. The aim of education is to fit men and women for the battle of life. We do not want to convert them into anchorites and ascetics. The boys and girls of today are the citizens of tomorrow. From among them must come our statesmen, administrators, generals, inventors, captains of industry and manufacturers, as much as, our philosphers and thinkers and teachers. Even sound thinking to be useful for practical purposes of life must be based on a full knowledge of the different phases of social life. All life is social. We are beginning to realize that the best social thinkers of the world have been those who were brought up in the full blaze of the social conditions of the time and who had personal experience of how men in general lived and how they acted and reacted on each other.

In my judgment, it is not a sound idea to make an anchorite of a boy or a girl. Boys and girls should have every opportunity of seeing life, moving in life, experiencing the shocks and reactions

of life. Boys brought up in isolation and girls brought up in Purdah make very very poor men and women. Often they have been seen succumbing to the first temptation they came across. They wreck their lives from want of experience and want of nerve. I am speaking from actual experience. Not that men educated in ordinary schools and colleges are always better ; but that at least the former have not shown any superiority in handling situations which arise of being thrown into social conditions to which they were strangers before. My experience justifies me in saying that the former go to greater extremes, in laxity of character and looseness of behaviour than the former. They lack the power of adjustment. It is my desire to impress upon my countrymen with all the earnestness I possess, and with all the emphasis I can lay, the absolute desirability of giving up the antiquated idea of bringing up boys and girls in an atmosphere of isolation. Boys and girls should be treated more as comrades, rather than dependents and inferiors and slaves. We should extend to them our fullest confidence and encourage absolute frankness in them. Instead of keeping the sexes away, we should bring them together. In my judgment greater harm is done by keeping them apart than by bringing them together. I know I am treading on delicate ground. Prejudice and sentiment accumulated by centuries of restricted life is all against it. The thing will come by degrees. But come it must and come it will.

It will be so much waste of energy not to profit by the experience of other peoples. Our ideas of morality and decency must undergo change. Our boys and girls must grow in an atmosphere of frankness, freedom and mutual confidence. Away with suspicion and distrust. It breeds hypocrisy, sycophancy and disease. The future teachers and Gurus of India must learn to set aside the tone of command and authority to which they have hitherto been accustomed. The boys and girls are not clay in their hands to be moulded into patterns of their choice. That was a stupid idea, if ever it existed. They are living beings, products of nature, heredity, and environments. They throb with the same impulses and desires and ideas as we do. These impulses and desires require sane guidance. They cannot be regulated by mere authority, or mainly by authority without inflicting awful injury on their manhood and womanhood. We command them to do things of the righteousness and value, of which they have

not been convinced. The result is a habit of slavish submission to authority. I recognize that we cannot perhaps eliminate the element of command altogether from the education and bringing up of boys and girls. They must, sometimes, be protected from themselves. But the command should be the last step, taken with reluctance and out of a sense of unavoidableness which comes by having otherwise failed to arouse an intelligent understanding in the child.

Parents and teachers must learn to respect the child and to have a feeling of reverence for it. No Japanese ever strikes a child, yet the Japanese children are models of reasonableness. The Japanese maintain an attitude of respect towards their children. They treat the children as their equals and always address them as such. They never criticise them. The use of the rod is absolutely unknown in Japanese homes. Harsh language towards children or an expression of anger is very rare. The Japanese code of life is very strict in certain respects. It exacts strict obedience and strict discipline from every citizen. Japanese soldiers have earned a name for their sense of duty and for strict discipline, but that comes more out of a traditional love for the country and its sovereign, than by enforcing authority and penalties in childhood. In short the system that stresses the authority of the teacher or the parent; which is based on a suspicion of human nature and human tendencies, which is distrustful of childhood and youth, which is openly out for control and discipline and subordination, which favours empirical methods of pedagogy, which has no respect for the instincts of the boy and girl is not an ideal system to produce self-reliant, aggresive (in order to be progressive), men and women that new India wants. I come to the conclusion, therefore, that any widespread revival of the ancient or medieval systems of education is unthinkable. It will take us centuries backward and I am certain that the country will not adopt it. Mrs. Besant of course does not advocate it. But I know that there are groups of people in India who are in love with that system. They are sometimes carried away by a partial praise of certain features of their system by eminent foreigners and educationists. A system may be "fascinating" without being sound. It may be highly interesting as an experiment. It may be good for Governmental purposes yet harmful from the citizens' point of view. It may be good for producing certain types but harmful if adopted for the nation as a

whole. I would beg of my countrymen not to be carried off their feet, by the praises which the foreigner, sometimes bestows on our literature and on our system. Some of them do so, out of sheer disgust with their own systems of life. They do not wait to make proper comparisons, but rush from one extreme to another ; others only mean to pay a generous compliment. We should not be affected either by their praise or by their condemnation. We are in a critical period of our life, and it behoves us to weigh things in their true perspective, before laying down policies and making plans for constructive upbuilding of the nation. What is required is a sober study of the situation before making plans.

37. SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION IN INDIA-THE RELATIONS OF THE SEXES

THE SEX relation is the most important of all human relations. It is the foundation of society. Marriage, which regulates that relation, thus becomes the most important of all social institutions. It is the foundation of family life, which in its turn is the pivot round which society revolves. The sex relation is receiving a great deal of attention at the hands of the modern scientific world. It supplies a theme for more than half of the total output of literature and art. It rules supreme in prose, poetry, fiction, drama, sociology, philosophy and all the cognate subjects. Large and elaborate treatises, written by some of the best authorities in the social sciences (including the medical) dealing with the sex problem from every conceivable point of view, are multiplying. Some of them furnish the most illuminating reading on the subject. The question is so important and so far-reaching in its consequences to humanity at large, and to communities, that neither individuals nor nations can neglect it except at the peril of their efficiency.

The religious literatures of the world, the codes of the different nations prove how important the question has been at all times, in all countries and under all circumstances. The primitive man attached as much importance to it as his cultured brother did later and as the modern man does now. No law giver could ignore or neglect it. Moses, Christ and Mohamed paid as much attention to it as Manu, Confucius and Zarathustra did. The "Code Justinian" deals with it, and so does the "Code Napoleon."

It is the phase of life in the handling of which the world has shown that variety of point of view, which is at once the

Originally published in The *Modern Review*, January and February 1920. It was obviously written before Lajpat Rai's return to India in 1920.

beauty and the curse of this world of ours. No two nations ever took the same view of the sex relations. In no two countries were the laws of marriage the same. In no two centuries in the same country was the sex morality the same.

A careful study of the ethical history of the world proves that ethical and moral standards have varied with time, place and circumstances. There has been no such thing as a universal code of morality. The rules of morality, especially those falling under the head of sex-morality, have been different and are different in different countries and communities. They are sometimes different in the various internal social groups of one and the same community. That they have been different in different times has been established beyond a shadow of doubt. Every age and every community has surrounded its own code of morality with a halo of sanctity. Yet the succeeding generations had no scruples to tear down the old edifice and build a new one in its stead. Sometimes they have done it by a process of amplification; at others by quiet modification; so that today we are inclined to think that the progressiveness of a nation or community is revealed by the frequency of the changes that have taken place in its standards and ideals and rules of morality. Fixity of moral values for any great length of time is evidence of stagnation rather than of progress. A boast that our moral standards are the same today as they were three thousand years ago is a sign of senility.

"Morality," says Havelock Ellis, "is fundamentally custom, the *mores* of a people. It is a body of conduct which is in constant motion, with an exalted advance-guard which few can keep up with and a debased rear-guard. In the substantial and central sense, morality means the conduct of the main body of the community." "The collective conscience in the shape of moral precept, lays down the conventional code which must be open to change,"says another great writer. The diversity of moral codes among different nations and at different stages of civilization proves that no moral precepts can be accepted as permanently unalterable. Of course, every nation considers its own code and its practices morally superior, if not perfect. Other nations are looked down upon by the measure of one's own national standards. A European Christian coming to the East very solemnly

deplores the loose morality of the Hindus, Muslims and Buddhists, of the Chinese and the Japanese. Judging them by his own standards, he calls them names—barbarians, half-civilized, uncivilized, primitive, immoral, etc.

A Hindu or Mussalman coming to Europe is shocked at the immorality of the white man. The fact is that the one is perhaps as much moral or immoral as the other. A pious Christian feels highly indignant at what he considers the orgies of *Tantric* practices in India. As a matter of fact the vast bulk of the Indians know nothing of them or about them. The Christian critic fishes them out, either by laborious study of the *Tantric* literature, or by clever cross-examination of his native servants, who, in their turn, have used the amplifying process on what they have heard as stories. The Hindu or the Mohamedan visitor to Europe and America feels that the worst orgies of *Tantric* practices fall into the shade in comparison with what goes on in the all-night clubs and other pleasure resorts of Paris, Berlin, London and New York. Similarly, a Japanese when lectured on the shocking immorality of an institution like the *Yosihwara* of Tokyo may well retort that the *Yoshiwara* is a much more moral institution than many nursing homes, and massage and bath parlours of London and New York.

When an oriental enters into a close study of sex conditions in Europe and America and hears it stated, on what appears to be unimpeachable authority, that between 75 and 90 per cent. of the population of certain cities of these continents suffer or have suffered at one time or another, from venereal diseases, he begins to consider that compared with this the conditions in the Orient are those of bliss. He forgets, however, that while perhaps venereal diseases are not so rampant in the Orient as in the Occident, the other conditions of social life there are so unnatural and unsocial as to make life a hell, a thing to be despised rather than praised. The truth is that all judgments upon the morality of nations, other than our own, are, oftener than not, the result of prejudice, ignorance and conceit. We judge others by our standards, without the guarantee of our standards being the best and the most reasonable.

The history of the Hindus shows that the ideas of sexual

morality prevailing at the time of the Mahabharata were in all probability somewhat different from those that were current in Vedic times; as they certainly are different from what subsequently developed first under Brahmanic and then Muslim influences. The mere mention of the manner in which the great body of the Pandus and many other Epic heroes were ushered into existence would shock the sense of decency of a modern Hindu, man or woman. How deeply does a Hindu flush with indignation and shame when listening to the stories of loose sex relationships mentioned in the Puranas. Serious efforts are put forth to explain away their apparent meaning by a "series of esoteric interpretations that are read into them." I do not say that all the stories are historical facts or that they are true narrations of facts as they happened nor can any one ignore the manifest symbolism that underlies at least some of them. Yet, after all has been said, it cannot be denied that these stories represent the ideas of morality that were current at the time when they were composed. It should at the same time by no means be forgotten that from hoary antiquity the race consciousness of the Hindu has rightly taken joyous pride in the ideal of the single-minded devotion of husband and wife to each other, even after the death of one of the two, as embodied in the stories of Shiva and Sati, Savitri, and Satyavan, Nala and Damyanti, Vasishtha and Arundhati, and Sita and Rama.

I have dilated on this point at such length because I want to impress upon my countrymen that, whether looked at from the fundamental or from the historical point of view, there is nothing unnatural or shameful in our revising our ideas of sex morality, much less in discussing what changes are needed in our marriage laws. By our attacks on the abominable institution of child-marriage, by our championing the right of the widow to remarry, by the insistence with which the social reformers have been running down polygamy and by the half-hearted and timid acknowledgment which we have accorded to the right of the parties to make their own choice of their mates, we have practically admitted the necessity of a revision of our ideas about the institution of marriage. The influences that have so far moulded our opinions on the subject are partly religious and partly social. The glaring injustice of the situation which allowed

a plurality of wives to the same man, had its share in moulding our opinion. There can be no manner of doubt that the existing inequalities between the rights of men and women, in the matter of marriage, sanctioned by law and custom, Hindu and Mohamedan, are indefensible. All efforts made to remove or at least lessen them must, therefore, be commended. What the social reformer has, therefore, so far attempted or achieved, deserves praise. But henceforth our attempts at social reform should be based on a fundamental scientific study of the subject of sex relations.

What we need is an independent study of principles and an independent application of them to our life. Blind imitation of what is going on in Europe and America would be as detrimental to progress as a blind acceptance of the notion that the Christian morality of marriage is the last word on the subject.

A scientific study of the whole question may reveal that there is much in our own customs that is worthy of being preserved or revived, as that there is much in the conventions of Christian morality that deserves to be condemned and rejected. The whole question should be investigated on its merits, without any bias. But this last is more easily said than done. There are certain prejudices and biases which one has inherited, which are rooted deep down in his nature, which he has drunk with his mother's milk, which are part and parcel of his constitution. To throw them away and to divest one's self of them by force of will is not impossible, but extremely difficult. This is a feat which can be achieved by very few. These "very few" must be the vanguard of the army of reform and reconstruction.

Social life in India must be reconstructed on a scientific basis. The struggle will be long and tiresome, but it must be faced by those who realise the importance of the issue. The pioneers will, as usual, be hunted down, denounced and attacked vehemently. But though wounded and lacerated, they must not falter. They must speak the truth and lead their countrymen on to the paths of progress. Personally I lay no claims to speak on the subject with authority. I have not made a scientific study of it, nor do I possess the necessary qualifications for such a study. With my numerous other interests I have had no time even to make an exhaustive study of what has already been written and said on the

subject by persons competent to pronounce opinions and propound theories. What I am attempting in this paper is to draw the attention of my countrymen to the urgent necessity of a thorough investigation of the matter before public opinion clarifies and tendencies take root, which it may afterwards require even greater labour to uproot. With these prefatory remarks I propose to make a few observations on the different points involved in the discussion of the subject, leaving my readers to pursue it in the pages of those authors who have written on it after a life-long study and who speak with the authority that is attached to original thinking and scientific research.

II

However much we may try to explain away ugly facts, it cannot be denied that the position of woman in India just now, and for some time past, has been very low, though it was higher in some past ages. The women of India, Hindu or Mohamedan, form a a submerged class, though many of them justly wield great influence in the family circle and in society. The generality of women have been greatly depressed and their uplift is as necessary both from the moral and social points of view as that of the depressed classes. Yet I am afraid I cannot swallow all the talk that goes on about the equality of men and women. To me it seems that the people who talk of "equality" *per se*, lack exactness of thought and expression. Woman is woman and man is man. To say that both are absolutely equal in every respect is nonsense, pure and simple. Why, woman is superior to man in several respects. No man can stand comparison with woman in the latter's capacity to love absolutely, disinterestedly, loftily, devotedly, to mother, to heal and cure, to comfort and solace. to sacrifice and give, to efface herself and to suffer. The stream of kindness and love that flows from her bosom, the creativeness that is her function in life, these alone put her head and shoulders above men. On the other hand, in his spirit of masterfulness, in his physical capacity to fight and to endure, in his ability to rule, conquer nature and also his fellowmen, man is decidedly superior to woman.

In his collection of "Essays in War Time" (1917) Havelock Ellis devotes one essay to "The mental differences of men and women" and notices the "contradictory" and often extravagant

opinions that are maintained on the subject. Many assume that there are no mental differences between men and women, but there are others for whom the mental superiority of man at every point is an unquestionable article of faith. There are others again who hold that "the predominance of men is an accident, due to the influence of brute force; let the intelligence of women have free play and the world will be straightened out." He then proceeds to discuss the question on "a fairly sound and rational basis", and says :

"At the outset there is one great fundamental fact always to be borne in mind; the difference of the sexes in physical organization. That we may term the biological factor in determining the sexual mental differences. A strong body does not involve a strong brain, nor a weak body a weak brain; but there is still an intimate connection between the organization of the body generally and the organization of the brain, which may be regarded as an excessive assemblage of delegates from all parts of the body. Fundamental differences in the organization of the body cannot fail to involve differences in the nervous system generally, and especially in that supreme collection of nervous ganglia which we term the brain. In this way the special adaptation of woman's body to the exercise of maternity, with the presence of special organs and glands subservient to that object, and without any important equivalents in man's body, cannot fail to affect the brain. It is not, we must remember, by any means altogether the exercise of the maternal function which causes the difference; the organs and aptitudes are equally present even if the function is not exercised, so that a woman cannot make herself a man by refraining from child-bearing."

He considers the differences in the muscular systems of men and women also fundamental. "Even in savages, among whom the women do most of the muscular work, they seldom or never exceed the men in strength." In civilization, even under the influence of careful athletic training, women are unable to compete muscularly with men; and it is a significant fact that on the variety stage there are few "strong women".

Whatever the cause may be, the resulting difference is one which has a very real bearing on the mental distinction of men and women. It is well ascertained that what we call "mental fatigue"

expresses itself physiologically in the same bodily manifestation as "muscular fatigue". He then proceeds to quote facts which have been ascertained by a comparative study of figures supplied by the records of Insurance and Sick Benefit Societies and finds that women are tired out more easily than men and that consequently their work is less valuable.

Discussing the greater precocity of girls, he observes that precocity "is a quality of dubious virtue. It is frequently found, indeed, in men of the highest genius, but on the other hand it is found among animals and among savages, and is here of no good augury. In the comparison of girls and boys, both as regards physical and mental qualities, it is constantly found that while the girls hold their own, and in many respects more than hold their own, with boys upto the age of fifteen or sixteen, after that the girls remain almost or quite stationary, while in the boys the curve of progress is continued without interruption."

Discussing another aspect of the biologocial factor in the bearing of heredity on the question, Mr. Ellis characterizes the conviction of some men that women are not fitted to exercise various social and political duties, and the conviction of some women that men are a morally inferior sex, as absurd, for they both rest on the assumption that women do not inherit from their fathers, nor men from their mothers. From the biological factor he descends to the historical factor and observes :

"We are prone to believe that the particular status of the sexes that prevails among ourselves corresponds to a universal and unchangeable order of things. In reality this is far from being the case. It may, indeed, be truly said that there is no kind of social position, no sort of avocation, public or domestic, among ourselves, exclusively pertaining to one sex, which has not at some time or some part of the world belonged to the opposite sex, and with the most excellent results."

He cites several examples, one of which is worth reciting here :

"In some parts of Africa a woman never touches a needle; that is man's work and a wife who can show a neglected rent in her petticoat is even considered to have a fair claim for a divorce "

He sums up his conclusions thus :

"When we attempt to survey and sum up all the variegated

facts which science and practical life are slowly accumulating with reference to the mental differences between men and women, we reach two main conclusions. On the one hand there is a fundamental equality of the sexes. It would certainly appear that women vary within a narrower range than men—that is to say, that the two extermes of genius and idiocy are both more likely to show themselves in men. This implies that the pioneers in progress are most likely to be men. That indeed may be said to be a biological fact. On the other hand, the mental diversity of the men and women is equally fundamental. It is rooted in organization. The well-intentioned efforts of many pioneers in women's movements to treat men and women as identical, and, as it were, to force women into masculine moulds are both mischievous and useless. *Women will always be different from men, mentally as well as physically.* It is well for both sexes that it should be so. It is owing to these differences that each sex can bring to the world's work various aptitudes that the other lacks. It is owing to these differences also that men and women have their enduring charm for each other. We cannot change them, and we need not wish to."

The conclusions arrived at by Mr. Ellis, who is one of the greatest authorities on the question, are so manifestly sound and sensible as to seem conclusive. I accept them for myself and commend them to the consideration of my fellow-countrymen. I have made these lengthy quotations because I want my countrymen to avoid the mistakes which they are likely to make if they accept the identicalness of the sexes so often advocated by the champions of woman's rights. That does not imply that I am in any way opposed to the women's right to vote. Yet it is important that social reformers should have a clear grasp of the fundamentals.

Whenever asked about the relative positions of the sexes in India, I have always said that although now and in the centuries immediately preceding the present the position of woman in India has been inferior to man, it was not always so.

III

I am not aware of any discussion in the Vedic literature on the relative positions of the sexes. In early Hindu literature man is treated as man, and woman as woman. No idea of the superiority of the one or the inferiority of the other is discernible until we come

to later writers. In fact the Hindu theory of creation which credits Brahma with having divided his body into two parts, with one creating man and with the other woman, places woman on a much superior footing than the one implied by the Christian theory of Genesis which makes Eve come out of the ribs of Adam, thus making her only a part of him. In any case it is safer and sounder to have a clear grasp of the matter than be confused by a discussion of the equality of the sexes or the superiority of one over the other. Mr. Ellis puts it well when he says that it is for the good of the world that men and women are different. Difference does not, however, involve the inferiority of woman, nor does it justify a denial of equal opportunities of progress to her or a denial of freedom to her to live her life in the same way as man claims to live his. If a man is free to live his life, choose his avocation, regulate his conduct, exercise his rights, perform his obligations, so must a woman be. In order to be able to rise to the full height of her womanhood, the woman has as much right to education and freedom as man has. There can be no limit to her development; no curtailing of her liberties without harming the whole of society.

The present position of women in India is extremely harmful to the progress of the community. It substantially hinders the religious, the social, the physical, the mental and the material progress of the nation. From the point of view of final social values, no question is of greater urgency than that of the restoration of their rights to women, *viz.*, their right to education and freedom of action. The ancient Hindus recognised no limitations to a woman's right to education; nor restricted her freedom of action except what her status as wife or mother entailed on her by virtue of these positions. A nation which tolerates the bondage of her mothers cannot make rapid progress towards freedom of any kind.

The writer is not unaware of the difficulties in the way of the restoration of their rights to Indian women. The ignorance of the masses is the chiefest of them; the narrow education which the Indians receive in schools and colleges is another; the deep-rooted sentimental prejudices are the third.

The writer has noticed with regret that a very large number of his educated countrymen seem to have very crude ideas about the education of women. That the girls are entitled to education and

should receive education, is now generally conceded, even in orthodox circles. But as to the degree and kind of education which women should receive, the greatest diversity of opinion prevails. In certain influential circles an opinion is often expressed that the education of boys and girls should proceed on entirely different lines. Some people would limit the education of girls to an elementary knowledge of the three R's, an acquaintance with religious literature and a training in domestic duties. Their ideal of a woman is a religious dame who can read religious literature, raise children in an atmosphere of health and religion, is proficient in cooking and sewing and is generally obedient to her husband. For a long time for the first three quarters of the 19th century, the same was the ideal of the West. The last quarter of the 19th century has brought about a revolutionary change in the position of woman in the West. There seems no reason why educated India, with access to the history of the development of woman's position in the West should accept the ideals of the first half of the 19th century.

To me it seems that the educated Indian's ideas about women and their right to full freedom in the matter of education are reactionary because of the atmosphere of snobbery in which he is brought up. It is a fashion in certain educated circles in India to talk of the Western woman in language of strong disapprobation. The Western woman is by no means a paragon of virtue. She has her own faults and so has the Eastern woman. The pictures of Western women drawn by biased Indians are as true or untrue to life as the pictures of Eastern women by Christian missionaries and globe trotters. In both cases they are the result of bias, hasty generalisation and a false pride in the superiority of one's own standards. The missionary indulges in these generalisations with a motive. He wants funds and workers to carry on his propaganda. For this he depends on the sympathy he excites by his description of the pitiable and oppressive condition of the Eastern women. This motive creates a bias which often, perhaps unconsciously, leads him to unjust and exaggerated views about the condition of Eastern women. The oriental traveller in the West, on the other hand, loses his balance, when he sees the freedom enjoyed by women in the West. He ascribes it to their barbarous sensuousness. His opportunities of coming into contact with the best type of Western women are perhaps as rare as those of the Christian missionary

working in the East. For a proper understanding of the question it is needed that both the occidental and the oriental should approach it from a scholarly scientific point of view and free their minds as much as possible from preconceived biases. The question has received a scientific treatment from Western scholars. There is evidence that our ancestors had studied it in a scientific spirit. We owe it to ourselves, to our women and children, to investigate it on the same lines and in the same spirit.

The Easterner has an inherent prejudice against revolutionary changes, but revolutionary changes are a part of the evolutionary process. This truth holds good in all phases of social life. What one part of the world has achieved by evolution may well be accepted by the other parts without necessarily going through the same process of struggle and conflict It took the world a long time to invent the steam engine and the use of electricity for the purposes of man. These scientific truths were first brought to light in Europe but that is no reason why Asia should not at once use steam and electricity without waiting for some Asiatic to re-invent the same things again in Asia.

I see no justification for the belief that the educational needs of men and women are so radically different as to require two entirely different kinds of education. It may be that the education of our boys is proceeding on erroneous lines and we are anxious to avoid the mistakes of which we have been guilty in the case of our boys. If so, we should be equally solicitous to educate our boys also on right lines. Our ideas of the educational requirements of our women should not be based on what we would like them to be—affectionate wives and good mothers only. We certainly want affectionate wives and good mothers but women are more than that, just as men are more than affectionate husbands and good fathers. Just as a boy needs an education which will help his complete development to manhood, so a girl needs education which would help her complete evolution to womanhood. The same principle must guide the education of both, may be with minor differences in details. But to say that the two systems should be radically different is to display either prejudice or ignorance or both. What, however, is wrong with us, is that our ideas of education are not sound. The woman has as much need of individuality, freedom, resourcefulness, initiative, courage, economic independence and intellectual growth

as man has. The needs of the Indian woman in this respect are exactly the same as those of the Western woman. Climatic conditions may require certain differentiations, but subject to that we will profit immensely by the experience of the West in the educational development of women. The question is important enough to need a specialised study by some of our eminent educationists.

IV

Having discussed the general questions of sexual ethics, of the position of woman and of education of women in India, I propose now to take up the question of marriage. According to Bertrand Russel:

"There are two questions to be asked in regard to any marriage system; just how it affects the development and character of the men and women concerned; secondly, what is its influence on the propagation and education of children. These two questions are entirely distinct, and a system may well be desirable from one of these two points of view when it is very undesirable from the other."

Following Bertrand Russel's example I propose first to describe the Hindu and the customary laws of India and public opinion and practice in regard to the relation of the sexes.

I will take the Hindu Law and the practice among the Hindus first. Marriage under Hindu Law is a religious sacrament. It is an indissoluble tie which lasts for the life-time of the parties. Among the three higher castes no divorce is allowed by the law as administered in these days. Under certain circumstances the law sanctions more than one wife for the husband, but under no circumstance does it countenance more than one husband for the wife. Again under certain circumstances the law allows the husband to remarry in the life-time of one or more wives, but under no circumstances is a woman allowed to remarry in the life-time of her husband. For centuries it was unlawful for women to remarry after the death of their husbands, but now the remarriage of widows has been made lawful by statutory law.

In theory Hindu Law enjoins marriage on every man and woman. There are certain exceptions in the case of men, who at an early period of their life decide to devote themselves to a lifelong study and practice of religion and to propaganda work. A wife may

accompany a husband when the latter enters *Vanaprastha Ashram* but the pair must separate when the husband decides to become a *Sanyasi.* I know of no authority which expressly sanctions *Sanyas* for women. To all intents and purposes it is assumed, nay expressly stated in the later *Smritis*, that a woman can never be independent. In her childhood she is under the control of her parents, when married she is subordinate to her husband, when widowed or otherwise deprived of the guardianship of her husband, she must submit to the control of her grown-up sons or other male relatives. If so, there is no chance for her to lead a life of independence and freedom except by violation of the law. Custom enforces the law in this respect rather rigorously. There are certain sects particularly amongst the Jains, in which the women are allowed to become *Sadhinis* (*i.e.* female ascetics), but the number of female ascetics in India is infinitesimal as compared with male *Sadhus.*

Accordingly a woman has no voice in her marriage even when grown up. The later *Smritis* leave no occasion for such an exercise of choice. They presuppose that every girl shall be given in marriage by her parents or other guardian before she attains the age of puberty. A father or brother or uncle who neglects to arrange for the marriage of his daughter or sister or neice before they arrive at the age of puberty is threatened with all kinds of real or imaginary punishments. In the very extreme case of a girl not having been married before she reaches the age of puberty and in case of continued neglect for three years on the part of her male guardian she is permitted to take a husband of her own choice.

We do not know of any period in the history of the Hindus when the women were absolutely free in the matter of marriage. The Vedic texts on the subject presuppose the consent of the bride, but whether they contemplate a choice of a husband by a maiden against or independent of the consent or wishes of her parents is extremely problematic. The only exceptions, if I am not mistaken, are those in which the choice of a husband was made by *Swayamvara.* The very expression means self-choice. The well-known case of Sanyogta who selected Prithvi Raj even in his absence and insisted on marrying him and him only even against the wishes of her father is a case in point. Sanyogta's father and Prithvi Raj were political enemies. Sanyogta had never seen or met Prithvi Raj. She had only heard of

him. At the time of the *Swayamvara* ceremony Prithvi Raj was not present. To show his contempt for Prithvi Raj, Sanyogta's father, Jai Chand, had a clay image of his put in the hall, assigning him the menial duty of washing the dishes. Yet when Sanyogta entered the hall with the garland of flowers in her hand, and the whole assemblage of princes and nobles were thrilled with the expectations of good luck, Sanyogta went straight to the clay image of Prithvi Raj and garlanded it. Her choice was made. It was irrevocable. Her father refused to ratify it. He was angry. But Sanyogta's decision had been made. She sent a secret message to Prithvi Raj to come and claim her. Prithvi Raj did come and his attempt to obtain possession of the person of Sanyogta was successful, though not before rivers of blood had been shed between the adherents of the two royal houses. This romantic affair cost India her political independence.

Marriages of love are not entirely unknown to Hindu Law but they are always treated as exceptions and the *Sutras* and *Smritis* speak of them in rather apologetic language. Going as far back as the time of the Epics every man seeking the hand of a maiden, however grown up, had to obtain the consent of her parents. Even Santanu, the Emperor, dared not marry the daughter of a common fisherman with whom he had fallen in love at first sight, without obtaining the consent of her father. How the father of the girl dictated his own terms to the love-lorn monarch is very graphically described in the pages of the *Mahabharata*. He would not give his daughter in marriage to the king without the latter promising with the consent of the heir-apparent Bhisma that the succession to the kingship would devolve on the eldest son of his daughter. Nay, he went further and insisted that Bhisma should, not only renounce the throne for himself but also for his issue, which Bhisma did by taking the vow of life-long celibacy. This incident alone (with numerous others to support it) ought to be a sufficient answer to those detractors of India who say that Indians had no respect for law. A comparative study of marriage laws of the world in the different epochs of the world's history would show that nowhere have women been altogether free in the choice of their husbands. But it appears that in India until the inauguration of the custom of child marriage, no maiden could be forced to marry a person she did not like.

The institution of child marriage, however, changed the

whole aspect of the question. Boys and girls could not be expected to choose their mates. So the choosing was done by their parents. Now, generally speaking, parents must be presumed to be the best friends of their offspring. But as we know, sometimes, even the best friends may be your worst enemies. Considerations of their own good may swing them away from the path of altruism. Sometimes with the best of motives they may be guilty of conduct which ruins the lives of the two persons whom they unite in wedlock for their mutual good. But instances are not lacking where parents have been swayed by the meanest and the most sordid considerations in arranging the marriages of their children. Even in the West, where child marriage (though among Italians and Jews marriages of girls at the age of 12 were not uncommon a short time ago) does not at present prevail, parents have, in not a few cases, exercised their authority in a most arbitrary fashion out of sordid and mean motives. The evil, however, reaches its climax where the parties concerned are minors and altogether unable to look after their own interests.

Educated India has, with one voice, condemned the institution of child marriage. It has also declared in favour of young men being allowed to choose their own wives, but it has not yet done anything to confer the same right on girls. This is probably due to the lack of education among girls as also to their economic dependence. It is obvious that the first condition of a happy marriage is the free choice of their mates by the parties. Many Indians have been heard to say that marriages among Westerners are no more happy than among the Indians; that the percentage of happy marriages is perhaps greater in India than in Europe and America. I do not agree with this opinion.

What is the test of happiness ? A forced happiness brought about by a sense of helplessness and inevitableness is not real happiness. Two young people brought together by the will of their parents find that, willy-nilly, they must accept the situation. The girl knows that for her there is no way out of it, unless she makes up her mind to be a life-long widow or is prepared to take to a life of disrepute. So she starts by presuming that her husband and lord is the most handsome, the most virtuous and the only man for her. She begins to love him and gives all that she has in his service. The devotion of the Hindu wives to their husbands is something sublime, superb.

But after all it is the devotion that is born of a feeling of helplessness. The economic dependence also is a factor. On the other side, the man also finds that although legally he could marry another woman, yet a second marriage would bring such an amount of social obloquy in its train and besides would be economically so costly that the very idea is unentertainable. Women in India are not *cheap*. In some provinces the number of men exceeds that of women. Then the law entitles a wife to a maintenance suitable to the position in life of her husband. So in good many cases the man decides to make the best of the situation and eventually the devotion of the wife completely wins his heart and he in his turn makes a fairly good husband. But it is a fact that in an equally large number of cases the parties fail to adjust themselves and live in life-long misery. In each case the loss of happiness and satisfaction involved, leads to much waste and wickedness which effectively tells on the efficiency of the nation. There are however cases, few though in number, in which the man sets aside his first wife and marries another, leaving the first to a life of enforced widowhood. Now the very existence of these cases, however few, makes it necessary that in this respect the position of the man and the woman should be equalised. A law which affects injuriously and unjustly even one human being is bad and must be changed. But the change of the law means the freedom of divorce. The freedom of divorce, however, is an absurdity, where there is no freedom of marriage, Forced acquiescence in a marriage in which the parties to a marriage or at least one party, had no voice, is a denial of that freedom which is the fundamental right of every human being. It is a serious handicap to the development of the personalities of men and women and as such reprehensible.

A Hindu's sense of propriety is shocked when a young man refuses to marry a girl whom he has not seen and who has been selected for him by his parents. 'Why, this is unheard of', says the old man, 'who could have expected such a degradation of ideals or fall from the path of virtue'! But a girl's desire to see her proposed husband before marriage is still unheard of in India. It is time that girls should be encouraged to demand this right. Of course mere seeing is nothing. Parties to a marriage must know each other well, before they unite in wedlock. This introduces courtship, which is revolting even to most of the best educated Hindus and Muslims. The Western people have advanced greatly in this line. People argue

that for a young man and a young woman to become permanent partners in life they must know each other thoroughly, before they can take the final plunge. To a Hindu this may look like the coming down of the heavens. But we must make a beginning by insisting on the rights of the parties to see each other and to know each other. The first thing which the Indian mind requires to be accustomed to think is that the personality of a woman is as important, even if not more, as that of a man in the progressive evolution of mankind and the attainment of that state of emancipation which leads to salvation. The second thing which Indians need to be told is that bearing children is not the sole or even the principal function in the life of a woman. The idea that the only justification for marriage is the desire for offspring is a superstition, which deserves to be demolished. That the union of man and woman means certainly much more than the legal gratification of desire is a truth which should never be lost sight of. The ancient Hindus were quite right in their sociological ideas in imposing restraint even on married couples. These ideas are based on hygiene. Their chief purpose is to secure a healthy body and a healthy mind to the married couple as well as to the issue of the marriage. The union of man and woman helps them in the development of their personalities and that is the chief object of life. The bearing of offspring is a social duty: a duty which men and women owe to the race. It is also a personal duty, as the existence of children helps them in their own personal development also; but surely this is not their only or even their main business in life. A social system which reduces women to the position of child-bearing machines bears its own condemnation. The fact that celibacy is permitted by the Hindu Shastras in the case of both men and women, for advancement of learning and for spiritual development, amply proves that the bearing of children could not be the *summum bonum* of life either for men or for women. Even in this direction the Hindus went to the other extreme in giving celibacy the highest place in the list of virtues. The best course for the generality of men and women is to be natural and to avoid excess in either direction.

In order to ensure even a moderately happy and fruitful marriage it is necessary that,

(a) the couple be physically fit to become parents,

(b) that they start with love and attachment to each other,

which can only be known by at least a certain amount of social companionship before marriage,

(c) that they be free from the taint of disease, inherited or contracted, or, in other words, that they be eugenically fit, and

(d) that they be economically able to make a home.

The economic conditions that at present prevail in the West, whereby a large number of middle class and almost all of the working class women have to work for their livelihood ftom 8 to 12 hours a day, is hardly conducive to marital felicity. The marriage problem is as acute today in the West as it is from a different angle in the East. The nations of the West are trying legislative and educational experiments of different kinds. The problem is unsolved. The experimental stage is causing a great deal of laxity and promiscuity, which seems to be inevitable if the matter is at all to be determined without injustice to the fair sex. The Western woman is in revolt. She hates the present domination of men and is in open rebellion against man-made laws of marriage and divorce. It is only when men will realise that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, that a co-operative attempt will be made to arrive at a solution which may be satisfactory to both as well as to the race in general.

The chief difficulty comes into view when we start to consider marriage from the point of view of the welfare of the children. It is not rare that the interests of children come into conflict with the personal interests of the parents, either one or both. The welfare of the children demands (a) that the parents should be in full possession of health both physical and mental, at the time of conception, (b) that during conception, delivery and at least for a year afterwards, the mother should be absolutely free from economic and other kinds of worries, and (c) that up to the age of majority the child should get nourishing food, ample clothing, good housing and, last but not least, every facility for education. Under the circumstances any defect in the parents at the time of union and any subsequent estrangement between them regardless of the circumstances over which they have no control, for example, poverty and unemployment, are likely to be very harmful to a healthy and vigorous development of their children. Advanced European thinkers are of opinion that the best time of life for having children is

when the man and the woman having crossed the boundary of childhood, are throbbing with the passion of life. They are of opinion that the issue of even illicit unions should not be looked down upon; that every child that comes into life is sacred and pure, and that the prevailing social ideas which brand some children as illegitimate and bastard is barbaric. In their judgement, all children should be treated equally. Everyone of them is entitled to protection, maintenance and education on equal terms and that it is the duty of the society into which they are born to look after them and enable them to grow into men and women with healthy bodies and healthy minds. These writers are of the opinion that under the present, social and economic conditions the progress and development of the race is seriously handicapped by the restrictions that society imposes on the free marriage of men and women; that these restrictions result in unsuitable and undesirable unions, in unions late in life, after both men and women have wasted themselves in illicit satisfaction of their sexual appetite or in unnatural suppression of it; that marriages are often delayed because men and women are not economically well off to have a home and to provide for children; that even when married, many men and women, although fully healthy and desirious of having children, use artificial means of preventing the coming of children for want of means to support them and to educate them; that, as at present, the vast bulk of children come into life either too late or too early; that the great majority of them suffer either from the poverty or the folly of their parents. Healthy men and women have to go without children; while diseased and foolish but rich parents get children and thereby perpetuate a diseased and inferior humanity.

38. FAREWELL TO AMERICA

I REALLY DO not know how to thank you adequately for all the good things you have said of me. You have overwhelmed me with kindness and have paid compliments which are too flattering to be accepted at their face value. I take them as the measure of your interest in my country, of your sympathy with our cause, and of your desire to see that justice and democracy are established all the world over. I am sure my countrymen of all religions, creeds. classes and parties will very much appreciate what you have said and done for India today and on various occasions before.

Five years ago, I landed in New York without any intention of staying here so long and without any idea of starting the work, which circumstances and your kindness made it possible for me to inaugurate in 1916 on my return from Japan.[1] In 1914 I came here as a tourist and a student eager to see your great and beautiful country and to study its noble institutions. As a child and as a young man I was fed on the belief that America was the freest of all the countries of the world, where equality, liberty and fraternity reigned and where the people were inspired by goodwill and friendship of all the peoples of the earth without distinction of colour, creed, and caste. When I came here for the first time in 1905 I was a bit shocked by your treatment of the Negroes but otherwise I went back confirmed in my admiration for America and her institutions. When I returned in November, 1914, my chief purpose was to interpret America to India, with a view to enabling the latter to assimilate such of the American ideas and ideals as were likely to help her in her aspirations towards freedom, and in her

Speech delivered by Lala Lajpat Rai at a farewell dinner in NewYork on 28 November 1919. Dudley Field Malone was in the Chair and eloquent tributes were paid to Lajpat Rai on this occasion.

efforts towards national efficiency. For about eight months I travelled all over the United States, North, South, East and West, and wrote a book for the use of my countrymen embodying the results of my study. The book was published in India in 1916[2], and so eager were my people to know all about America that even in that land of illiteracy, famine, plague, and chronic poverty, the first edition was sold out in less than four months. From the United States I proceeded to Japan and studied its institutions, and wrote about that marvellous country and its phenomenal success.[3] While in Japan, receiving information of how Indians of independent political views, specially those returning from America and Japan, were being treated by the British Government of India, I lost no time in making up my mind to return to the United States. It was possible for me to do so because the United States had not yet entered the War and the Espionage Act and other laws restricting the right to travel, had not been enacted. On returning to America, I at once made up my mind what to do. I assumed the function of an Indian Nationalist Ambassador to America, whose duty was to inform the American public about the conditions in India. In assuming that function I foresaw how important American influence was destined to be in the affairs of the world and how difficult and stupendous was the task I was undertaking considering my own meager accomplishments and slender resources. On the principle of something better than nothing, however, I started work, relying more on your sympathy and co-operation than on my ability.

The first thing I did was to prepare my book "Young India" for the press. In this connection I am going to give out a secret about the publication of the book, as it was once said in the House of Commons, that the book had been published with German money and that I was subsidized by the German Imperial Government. There was not an iota of truth in either of these statements. The facts are that in 1915, when I was finally revising the manuscript, about five hundred dollars were placed at my disposal by one of my countrymen,[4] to see the book through. The man did not read the manuscript. If he had read it, perhaps he would not have helped its publication, as it was not quite complimentary to the party to which he belonged. This fact he discovered only after the book was out in October 1916, more than a year after he gave me

the money. Out of this sum I spent about one hundred dollars in getting the manuscript typed and the balance of four hundred dollars with the manuscript, I made over to Professor Pope,[5] then of the University of California (now with us here), who was a strong pro-ally in the War, to arrange for its printing. Professor Pope sent out the manuscript to a pro-ally publicist[6] of note in New York asking his aid for its publication. This gentleman handed it over to Mr. Huebsch who read it and generally approved by a noted English scholar at that time teaching in a Canadian University[7], and eventually published it on the understanding that I purchased three hundred copies with the money which Professor Pope had been entrusted with for the purpose. The book was so favourably received and reviewed by the American Press, including the *New York Times*, the New York *Evening Post*, *The New Republic*, that the first edition (which was a small one) was soon exhausted. In the meantime my second book, "England's Debt to India," was ready and that was published by Mr. Huebsch on similar terms.[8] Since then I have published other books also.

At no time before or during the War did I place my faith in the likelihood of India getting any help from Germany towards her freedom. When I arrived in New York in November, 1914 I found that some of my countrymen in this country were banking on the success of Germany. I argued the matter with them and refused to have anything to do with any movement which would place India in the power of Germany. At one time very large and tempting offers were made to me through one of my countrymen to sign the proclamation of Indian independence which was supposed to be thrown from aeroplanes into the ranks of the Indian Expeditionary Forces in France. I declined to do that. I give this as a piece of information for what it is worth.

During the War, in common with other thinking men and women I was in consistent danger of being "put out of the way." In fact some of my friends expressed their surprise at the latitude which I enjoyed in writing and speaking about British rule in India.

I now take pleasure in paying a tribute of gratitude both to the American Government and the American people for the courtesy and kindness I have received from them during my stay in this

country. From the officials I have invariably received courtesy and from the people in general, hospitality and kindness, amounting to generosity. The Liberal and Radical press of the country has been extremely generous and considerate towards me. Even the *New York Times* allowed me much space at first, but when the War dragged on it dropped me and would not even let me contradict things said against me in its columns. At this stage it was Mr. Villard[9] who with his innate sense of fairplay and justice came to my rescue. To you, sir, I and my country owe a debt of gratitude which we can never repay. You gave me opportunities of putting the case for India before the American public at a time when no other paper was prepared to risk doing so. If the New York *Evening Post* has been on the whole very fair to India it is due to the policy of fairplay initiated by you when still at the helm of that paper. I distinctly remember the sight of despair, which I uttered when one of the assistants in the *Evening Post* to whom I carried a letter of introduction from Prof. Seligman of Columbia, unceremoniously and rather curtly told me how impossible it was for his paper to take up the case of India so long as the War was on. For several months after that I made no attempt to try the *Evening Post* again. But finally when in search of something to do to earn a living, I approached you with a letter of introduction from one of the editors of the *New Republic*, you gave me an interview and, with the concurrence of your managing editor, immediately you promised me a modest hearing in the *Evening Post*. That was the dawn of a new day for India, as ever since then the case of India has never failed to receive a hearing in America.

For the last two years we have successfully maintained an organization, an office and a magazine which have been the centre of all of our activities to disseminate information about India and its affairs in the United States. In this respect the co-operation of the *Nation*, the *New Republic*, the *Dial* and the *New York Call* has been most valuable, for which I take this opportunity of expressing my personal gratitude to the editors of these papers. Equally valuable has been the co-operation of Liberal, Radical and Labour organizations.

When I landed in America the problem of India was a domestic problem of the British Empire. Few Americans knew anything

about conditions in India. At the present moment it is an international problem on which hinges, more or less, the future peace of the world, and on the right solution of which every human being is consciously or unconsciously interested. India is a vast country with unlimited resources and potentialities, inhabited by one fifth of the human race. The world cannot be safe for democracy without India being democratic, nor can the world ever think of a durable and lasting peace without the problem of India being solved to the satisfaction of the Indian people. The present condition of India is a menace to the peace of the world and certainly so to its development on democratic lines. India has much to give not only in raw materials, food, metals and merchandise, but also in ideas and ideals. Europe is at the zenith of its power and glory, but to what end is that power and glory if it must be spent in destruction or in disintegration and in the exploitation of the weak by the strong. The human mind must learn to think and act in terms of universal good, and in that line India can learn as well as teach. It is a criminal waste of human potentialities and possibilities to let the minds of 315,000,000 human beings who have been the builders and developers of a marvellous civilisation rot in defeat and despair. Help them, ladies and gentlemen, in freeing their bodies and minds from the bondage imposed upon them partly by a ruthless imperial system and partly by their own antiquated ideas, and they will be valuable allies in the struggle for human progress which you are carrying on with all your might and main.

We bear no ill-will against the British people. We harbour no grudge against any country. We hate none, not even our enemies. Our religion, our ethics, the whole spirit of our culture is against anger and hatred. We wage no war against anyone. But we are determined to come into our own, to be free to live our own life. We shall neither be dominated nor exploited nor used nor dictated to by any one—not even by angels, much less by human beings who are swayed by individual and national interests and who, intoxicated by the wine of power, cannot control their desire for gain. We have so far suffered with patience without making an effective protest, but no longer will we suffer without making our cries ring to heaven and over the earth and without disturbing the peace and pleasure of those who want to see us as hewers of wood drawers of water for them. Our men outside India have

shown that they can play a part, however, insignificant it may be at present, in joining hands with forces that threaten to disturb the peace of the world. Our men on the battle fields have shown that they can fight as valiantly and as desperately as any other people on the face of the globe. Last but not least, our people at home have proved that they can unite to make their protests effective and that if their cries go unheard and uncared for, our youth may some day feel compelled to make their protests more effective by means other than strikes and indignation meetings.

Ladies and Gentleman, I am now in the afternoon of life, but even when my body was pulsating with the wine of youth I was never carried away by mere theories, slogans and dreams. I am fully conscious of the might of Great Britain. I am equally conscious of our present helplessness to withstand that might. I recognize the facts as they are. I do not like war. I loathe bloodshed. Personally I have nothing but respect and appreciation for British character. I have my friends among them. Speaking for myself I shall be contented if my country shall be given a position of democratic equality within the British Commonwealth, enjoying the same rights and privileges, no less and no more, which are at the present moment being enjoyed by Canada and South Africa. With that as the immediate goal (and who can say what the remote goal may be) I can look forward with hope to the day when the whole world will be one commonwealth of the peoples of the earth guaranteeing liberty, equality and fraternity, to all the nations of the world, without distinction of colour, creed or caste. I am under no delusion, my friends, as to the kind of liberty and equality you "the freest people on earth," are at present enjoying. Never before in the history of the world was it so well demonstrated as now that, truly speaking, there can be no equality and liberty in any place on this globe so long as anywhere in the world there are masters and slaves, employers and employed, oppressors and oppressed, capitalists and proletariat, or so long as there are empires and imperialists. The road to progress is blocked by the corpses of dead ideas and ideals and by the bodies of dying principles and beliefs. The living and the dying are both struggling for relief from the smell and nausea of a polluted atmosphere which is suffocating and stifling multitudes who are yet alive and aspiring to live. Humanity is engaged in a death struggle. All honour to those

of you who are giving your best to free the human race from bondage, to bring about an era of universal fairplay and justice and brotherhood. I can assure you of the sympathy and co-operation of 315,000,000 fellow sufferers and fellow strugglers in India. Extend to them your invitation and your sympathy, and you will find their co-operation valuable and may be in certain respects decisive.

NOTES

1

Page 1 1. *Tahzib-al-Akhlaq* or the *Social Reformer* was started by Syed Ahmed Khan shortly after his return to India from England. The object of the paper was to prepare Muslims for religious reform and acceptance of progressive ideas. The first issue of the *Tahzib-al-Akhlaq* appeared on 24 December 1870. *Hayat-i-Javed* by Altaf Husain 'Hali', p. 133.

Page 1 2. The *Aligarh Institute Gazette* was the bi-lingual (Urdu and English) organ of the Scientific Society founded by Syed Ahmed Khan. It was started in 1866 as a weekly under Sir Syed's editorship and was issued later twice weekly. The paper stopped publication soon after his death. The *Gazette* had a twofold object—to educate Indians about the British political ideas and methods, and to inform the British rulers of the Indian problems and affairs. Sir Syed often contributed articles to the *Gazette* containing his views on political, educational and other subjects. *Hayat-i-Javed* by 'Hali', p. 103.

Page 1 3. Mehdi Hasan Khan who was given the title of Fateh Nawaz Jang by the Nizam was the Chief Justice of Hyderabad State in 1888. Mehdi Hasan was a Munsif in Rai Bareilly in Awadh before he joined the Nizam's service in 1883. His Urdu translation of Bentham's 'Utility' appeared in *Tahzib-al-Akhlaq* of 1879-80.

Page 2 4. *The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan* by Lieut. Col.G.F.I. Graham appeared in 1885.

Page 6 5. The reference is to the United Indian Patriotic Association organised in August 1888 at Aligarh by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. The Association was the main instrument of his anti-Congress activities. Its objects were : (1) to inform the members of Parliament and the people of England through newspapers and tracts that all communities of India, the aristocracy and the Princes, were not with the Congress and to contradict its statements ; (2) to keep the Parliament and the people of England informed about the opinions of Hindu and Muslim organisations which were opposed to the Congress ; and 3) to help in the maintenance of law and order and the strengthening of British rule in India and to wean away people from the Congress.

Page 8 6. Raja Shiva Prasad Gupta (1823-95) served faithfully for many years in the Foreign Department of the Government of India in different capacities. He was nominated a member of the Governor-General's Legislative Council in 1883. Syed Ahmed Khan was

nominated to the Legislative Council in 1878 and continued in that position for four years. There were no elected members of the Council.

Page 8 7. This speech was delivered by Raja Shiva Prasad Gupta on 9 March 1883 in the Legislative Council when it was considering the controversial Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill (1882), better known as Ilbert Bill. The object of the Bill was to abolish the invidious distinction on racial grounds between Indian Magistrates and European Magistrates to try cases of European offenders. The Anglo-Indian community vehemently opposed the proposed legislation. Raja Shiva Prasad in his speech in the Legislative Council had stated that Indians had not been just and fair in their dealings with other races.

Page 8 8. Raja Peary Mohan Muckerjee, a Bengal zamindar and prominent member of the British Indian Association, was a member of the Governor-General's Legislative Council in 1884 and 1886. The salt tax was raised in 1886.

Page 9 9. Dr. G. W. Leitner, Principal of the Government College, Lahore, entertained the idea of reviving ancient oriental learning and wider diffusion of vernacular studies. The Punjab University College, Lahore, founded in 1869, represented his educational ideals. This was opposed by the English educated Indians who wanted to promote the study of Western knowledge in the Punjab. Syed Ahmed Khan also opposed Leitner's scheme and lent his support to the protagonists of Western education.

Page 11 10. The Union Club was a debating society at the Aligarh College, on the model of the Cambridge University Union. It was organized with the object of training boys in public discussion on English lines. Sir Syed had visited Cambridge University during his visit to England.

Page 15 11. The East Indian Association in London which held its first meeting on 1 December 1866. The Association was jointly sponsored by eminent Indians in England like W. C. Bonnerjee and Dadabhai Naoroji and retired British officials who were sympathetic to Indian aspirations. It soon became very influential and was recognised as an important political association. It succeeded in securing considerable influence in the British Parliament. After 1884 the Association began to decline because of a change in the attitude of Englishmen towards India.

Page 16 12. Pandit Ajudhianath (1840-92) was an eminent leader of the Indian National Congress in its early days. He was the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the fourth Congress held at Allahabad in December 1888.

Page 18 13. Lord Dufferin, Governor-General of India from 1884 to 1888, attended the annual St. Andrews Day Dinner at Calcutta on 30 November 1888, shortly before he relinquished his office. In his speech on

this occasion he spoke about the policies of the Government of India. He said that while the Government was ready to associate educated Indians with the administration they could not accept the demands of the Indian National Congress for representative government in India. He also stated that the microscopic minority of educated Indians was not truly representative of the people.

Page 18 14. Delhi territory which formed a part of North Western Provinces before the Mutiny was incorporated in the Punjab in 1858. The Punjab was a Non-Regulation Province and North Western Provinces constituted a Regulation Province.

Page 20 15. This was delivered on 16 March 1888.

Page 24 16. Syed Ahmed Khan openly opposed the Indian National Congress when he addressed a gathering of Muslims at Lucknow on 28 December 1887. The Congress was meeting at that time for its third annual session at Madras under the presidentship of another eminent Muslim leader, Badruddin Tyabji. In his Lucknow speech Syed Ahmed challenged the very principle of representative government as applied to India. He expressed the view that representative institutions were not suited to Indian conditions as that would lead to the subjugation of the Muslims to Hindus because of the latter's numerical superiority. He exhorted Muslims not to support the Congress and to align themselves with the British Government to secure effective representation for the community in the administration of the country.

Page 51 1. This speech was delivered by M. G. Ranade at the Eleventh Session of the Social Conference held at Amraoti in December 1897. For full text of the speech see *Miscellaneous Writings of the late Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. G. Ranade* (Bombay, 1915) pp.180-197.

Page 60 1. Dharamsala and many towns and villages in Kangra district (Punjab) were rocked by a severe earthquake on 4 April 1905 and there was a great loss of life and property. Lajpat Rai successfully organised relief work for the victims of the calamity on behalf of the Arya Samaj.

Page 61 2. Lord Curzon made an attempt to raise the standard of higher education by the Universities Act of 1904 which resulted in officializing the administration of the Universities. Stringent conditions were laid down for the recognition of secondary schools by the Government of India Resolution on Education Policy of 11 March 1904. If these conditions were not fulfilled the schools could get neither government aid nor have the right of sending students for the University examinations. It was feared that the new rules would dis-

courage private efforts in secondary and higher education and also deprive the poor to receive education by paying low fees.

Page 62 3. Curzon made derogatory remarks about 'oriental' character in his Convocation Address at the Calcutta University on 11 February 1905. During the course of his address he said : "I hope I am making no false or arrogant claim when I say that the highest ideal of truth is to a large extent a Western conception. I do not thereby mean to claim that Europeans are universally or even generally truthful, still less do I mean that Asiatics deliberately or habitually deviate from truth. The one proposition would be absurd, the other insulting. But undoubtedly truth took a high place in the moral codes of the West before it had been similarly honoured in East, where craftiness and diplomatic wile have always been held in much repute. We may prove it by the common innuendo that lurks in the word, 'oriental diplomacy', by which is meant something rather tortuous and hyper subtle. The same may be seen in Oriental literature. In your epics truth will often be extolled as a virtue ; but quite as often it is attended with some qualification, and very often praise is given to successful deception practised with honest aim".

Page 62 4. The University Validating Act was passed in February 1905. The unpopular Indian Universities Act had been passed in 1904.

8

Page 68 1. Henry Fawcett (1833-84), Professor of Political Economy at Cambridge, championed the Indian cause in Parliament in the seventies of the last ceutury. He made Indian finances as his main interest and his writings on the subject constitute the first systematic approach to the problem. His researches led him to the conclusion that the Indian Empire was being ruled and ruined in the interest of certain classes and persons in Britain.

Page 74 2. See *Prosperous British India* by William Digby, London, 1901. Mr. Digby was the Secretary of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress for many years.

10

Page 88 1. Lajpat Rai's assessment of the situation proved to be correct. The Labour Representation Committee (LRC) a combination of the Independent Labour Party, the Fabian Society and Trade Unions, secured 29 seats in the General Elections of 1905 with a poll of 323,195 votes. In the 1900 Elections the LRC had won only two seats. Carl F. Brand, *The British Labour Party.* (Stanford University Press, 1964) p. 19.

11

Page 91 1. One of the repressive measures adopted by the Government of Bengal of which legality was questioned, was the Carlyle Circular. This was a secret circular issued by the Chief Secretary, R. W.

Carlyle, to Magistrates and Collectors on 10 October 1905 with the object of stopping the participation by students in Swadeshi and Boycott Movement. According to the circular the heads of schools and colleges were to be informed that in the event of their students participating in the movement, their grants-in-aid and their privileges of competing for scholarships and of receiving scholarship holders would be withdrawn and the University would be asked to disaffiliate their institutions. Another such circular was issued by the Government of East Bengal and Assam to the Commissioners and District Officers. Such measures on the part of the Government authorities led to the establishment of National Council of Education in Bengal.

Page 91 2. Barisal in East Bengal became one of the storm centres of the Swadeshi and Boycott Movement in 1905 under the leadership of Ashwini Kumar Datta. Stern repressive measures were adopted by the local government headed by Bampfylde Fuller and a reign of terror virtually prevailed in the district. Gurkhas were posted in the town and punitive police were posted at various places. The Bengal Provincial Conference at Barisal which was to be presided over by Abdul Rasul on 14-15 April 1906 was forcibly dispersed and Surendranath Banerjea was arrested.

Page 95 3. J. Bampfylde Fuller was the first Lieutenant-Governor of East Bengal and Assam. He assumed charge of this position on 16 October 1905 and was relieved on 20 August 1906. He was responsible for the repressive policy in his province and when the Government of India did not approve some of his actions he resigned.

12

Page 97 1. Resolution XII of the 21st Congress (Banaras, 1905) related to the Partition of Bengal. In this the Indian National Congress recorded "its emphatic protest against the Partition of Bengal in the face of the strongest opposition on the part of the people of the province" and appealed to the Government of India and the Secretary of State "to reverse or modify the arrangements made in such a manner as to conciliate public opinion, and allay the excitement and unrest manifest among large classes of the people." The resolution was moved by Surendranath Banerjea. Annie Besant, *How India Wrought for Freedom*, pp. 426-27 and 436-37.

14

Page 114 1. The import duties on cotton goods levied by the Government of India were opposed to the interests of the British manufacturers and the Home Government put pressure on the Government of India for their abolition. The import duty which was levied at 10% *ad valorem* in 1850 was reduced to 5% in 1875, but even this was not acceptable to the Lancashire manufacturers. The Secretary of State exerted a good deal of pressure on the Government of India but Lord North-

brook refused to abolish duties on cotton manufactures imported into India. On 11 November 1875 the Secretary of State wrote to the Governor-General regarding these duties : "On general principle it is liable to objection, as impeding the importation of an article of first necessity, and as tending to operate as a protective duty in favour of Native manufacture. It is thus inconsistent with the policy which Parliament, after very mature deliberation, has sanctioned, and which, on that account, it is not open to Her Majesty's Government to allow to be set aside without special cause, in any part of the Empire, under their direct control." (C. H. Philips, *The Evolution of India and Pakistan, Select Documents*, p. 599). The House of Commons passed a resolution on 10 July 1877 for the repeal of duties levied on cotton manufactures imported into India being protective in nature (Philips, *op cit.*, p. 600). The import duties were abolished in 1879. See Chapter V in Lajpat Rai, *England's Debt to India*, for a detailed discussion of the subject.

15

Page 118 1. The Indian Association was established at Lahore in 1877 on the same principles as the Calcutta Indian Association. J. C. Bagal *History of the Indian Association, 1876-1951* (Calcutta, 1953), p. 23.

Page 119 2. The Panjab University was incorporated in 1882 on the model of the existing Indian Universities and Dr. G. W. Leitner's scheme for an Oriental University in the province was set aside.

Page 120 3. The Punjab Land Alienation Act was passed on 19 October 1900 by the Governor-General's Legislative Council and the North-West Frontier Province was created in 1901 by separating the frontier districts of Hazara, Peshawar, Kohat, Bannu and Dera Ismail Khan, from the Punjab.

Page 120 4. Sir W. M. Young, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab had opposed the proposal for Government interference with the rights exercised by the landowners in respect of permanent alienation of their lands. He felt that no such conditions should be imposed which would make money-lenders' trade impossible. The Lieutenant Governor was of the view that the Government would incur the resentment of both the money-lender and the agriculturist if they interfered too much in the relations between them. (*Vide* note by Sir W. M. Young dated 20 July 1898, Government of India, Revenue and Agriculture Department—L. R. Proceedings, November 1898, no. 20) The Government of India under Lord Curzon decided on the creation of the North-West Frontier Province without consulting the Punjab Government. The Lieutenant-Governor lodged a protest against this procedure of taking a major decision without taking him into confidence. (Government of India, Foreign Secret Proceedings, March 1901, no. 3).

Page 126 5. At a meeting of eminent Bengal leaders held on 16 November

1905 it was decided to establish immediately a National Council of Education. The Bengal National College was inaugurated on 14 August 1906. Haridas Muckerjee and Uma Muckerjee, *The Origins of the National Education Movement,* pp. 35-38.

Page 127 6. The name of Bal Gangadhar Tilak had been proposed for the Calcutta Congress of 1906 by the Extremist group led by Bepin Chandra Pal, Arabinda Ghosh and others, but the Moderates were opposed to the idea. Finally the Moderates persuaded Dadabhai Naoroji to accept the Presidentship to avoid a contest.

18

Page 157 1. The Central Hindu College, Banaras, was founded in 1898 through the efforts of Mrs. Annie Besant. Among its promoters were the Maharaja of Banaras, G. N. Chakravarti, C. S. Trilokakar, B. Sanjiva Rao and Col. Olcott.

Page 158 2. The Fergusson College at Poona was started by the Deccan Education Society in 1885 ; M. A. O. College Aligarh came into existence in 1875 through the efforts of Syed Ahmed Khan ; D. A. V. College was opened in 1889 ; Central Hindu College in 1898 ; Gurukula at Kangri was founded by Mahatma Munshi Ram (Swami Shraddhanand) in 1902 ; and the National College at Calcutta was started in 1906.

19

Page 164 Denzil Ibbetson contributed a chapter on the "Punjab Castes and Tribes" to the *Indian Census Report* of 1881 which was issued as a separate volume.

Page 165 2. The All India Muslim League was founded at Dacca on 30 December 1906.

21

Page 180 1. The Extremist group feared that the four Calcutta Congress (1906) resolutions on Boycott, Swadeshi, National Education and Self-Government which had been adopted to appease them would be toned down by the Surat Congress which was dominated by the Moderates.

Page 181 2. The Convention called by Moderate leaders after the split was held at Surat on 28 December 1907. Lajpat Rai attended the Convention which appointed a Committee to draw up a constitution for the Congress. The Convention Committee met at Allahabad on 18 and 19 April 1908 and adopted the creed and the constitution of the Congress. Annie Besant, *How India Wrought for Freedom*, pp. 469-71.

Page 181 3. When Bal Gangadhar Tilak was sentenced to six years transportation for seditious writings in 1908 some persons charged Gokhale,

without any reason, of complicity with the Government in this matter.

Page 182 4. The Madras Congress which met in December 1908 under the new constitution expressed deep satisfaction with Lord Morley's despatch outlining the Reform proposals (Resolution II).

24

Page 213 1. These tracts were written by Allan Octavian Hume shortly after the founding of the Indian National Congress and widely distributed.

Page 214 2. The Press Act was enacted in 1910 and it received the support of G. K. Gokhale in the Imperial Legislative Council. S. P. Sinha was the Law Member at the time in the Governor-General's Council.

Page 215 3. Sir Valentine Chirol, the *Times* Correspondent, and the author of *Indian Unrest* (London, 1910).

Page 216 4. In 1914 efforts were being made to bring about reconciliation between the Moderates and the Extremists and to bring back the latter into the Congress fold. B. G. Tilak had been restored to freedom by that time. The Moderates were reluctant to change the rule regarding acceptance of the Congress creed as adopted in 1908 and pave the way for the readmission of the left wing. The efforts at reconciliation did not succeed.

Page 218 1. The Punjab experienced a serious banking crisis in September 1913 and all the Indian owned banks in the province, excepting the Punjab National Bank, had to close their business. This crisis paralyzed the industrial and commercial life of the Punjab, but the Government did practically nothing to relieve the suffering caused by the crisis.

Page 220 2. Two Arya Samajists, Raunaq Ram and Bishamber Dass, wrote in 1915 a tract *Sikh Panth-ki-Haqiqat* which contained attacks on Sikh religion. The publication was proscribed and the authors were prosecuted by Patiala State authorities.

Page 222 3. The *Tat* (real or true) *Khalsa* party was an advanced Sikh reform group which was known for its proselytizing activities, like the Arya Samaj.

Page 223 4. Approximately 4,000 Indians, mostly Punjabi Sikhs, migrated to British Columbia on the Pacific Coast of Canada at the close of the 19th Century and the first decade of the twentieth. The Canadian Government in order to prohibit further immigration from India adopted stringent measures. The most notorious of these was the Canadian Privy Council Order No. 920, generally known as "continuous journey clause." This order had virtually the effect of prohibiting Indians, not already settled in Canada, from going there as there was no steamship service between the two countries and

the steamship companies refused through bookings. The order also caused acute hardship to the Indian settlers in Canada as it prevented them from bringing their wives and children. In 1914 an attempt was made to obviate these difficulties and a ship, the *Komagata Maru*, was chartered by Indians to take about 400 immigrants to Canada. The Canadian authorities refused to allow landing of these men when the ship arrived at Vancouver, British Columbia. The tragic end of this voyage of the *Komagata Maru* is well-known.

26

Page 225 1. The Press Act of 1910 which was framed with the object of exercising more stringent control over seditious writings in Indian newspapers. Under this Act the Government was vested with the authority to demand security from any newspaper for publishing any offensive matter. The very nature of this law and the arbitrary manner in which it was administered brought forth numerous complaints from the Indian press and public opinion in the country was strongly in favour of its repeal.

Page 225 2. The reference is to the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh to Mandalay in May 1907 and of nine Bengali leaders—Ashwini Kumar Datta, Krishna Kumar Mitra, Satis Chatterjee, Subodh Mallik, Manoranjan Guha Thakurta, Shamsunder Chakravarti, Pulin Behari Das, Bhupesh Chandra Nag and Sachindra Prasad Basu—in December 1908 under the old Regulation III of 1818. None of the deportees was associated with any revolutionary or terrorist activity.

Page 226 3. The first act of terrorism by the Bengal revolutionary group took place at Muzaffarpur (Bihar) on 30 April 1908 and after that such acts of violence continued in India in spite of the Government's repressive measures. For a narrative of the activities of the revolutionaries see the ***Sedition Committee Report*** (Calcutta, 1918). Also see R. C. Mazumdar, ***History of the Freedom Movement in India***, Vol. II, Chapter VI, Militant Nationalism, pp. 265-327.

Page 227 4 Disturbances in the South-Western Districts of the Punjab in 1915 were unprecedented. According to the ***Punjab Administration Report for 1914-15*** (p. iii) "a section of the Mahomedan rural population partly under the stimulus of high prices and partly encouraged by mischievous reports in the Press and elsewhere as to the weakness of the British Government and the successes of its enemies, took advantage of the panic caused by outbreak of plague and the desertion of shops by Hindu owners to begin a campaign of lawlessness and looting in some cases combined with arson against their Hindu neighbours. Nearly 102 dacoities were committed in Jhang, Multan and Muzaffargarh districts, between the 22nd February and 20th March before order could be restored by the strengthening of the

police and movement of troops. Over 3,000 arrests were made. Special Magistrates were appointed to deal with bulk of the cases, the more serious being tried by a Special Tribunal at Multan "

Page 233 5. The Security of Rs. 2,000 of the *Comrade*, an English Weekly of Delhi and the Hamdard Press and the issue of the paper dated 26 September 1914 were forfeited (in November 1914) under Section 4 (i) of the Indian Press Act of 1910.

Page 234 6. Ajit Singh, Sawaran Singh, Lal Chand Falak and Kishan Singh were prosecuted at Lahore by the Punjab Government in 1910 for publishing and distributing the pamphlet, *Hindustan mein Angrezi Hakumat*' which was a translation in Urdu of W. J. Bryan's *British Rule in India*. Mr. Bryan was a candidate for the Presidency of U. S. A.

Page 234 7. On March 16, 1915 the House of Lords turned down the proposal for the creation of an Executive Council for the United Provinces. The proposal had been approved both by the Government of India and the British Government. The Council was to be created under the powers conferred on the Governor-General in Council by the Indian Councils Act of 1909.

Page 235 8. Several persons among those who were convicted in the Lahore Conspiracy Case (1915), four Supplementary Conspiracy Cases and other such trials, were Indians who had returned from America and were members of the *Ghadar* Party with its headquarters in San Francisco. For details see *An Account of the Ghadar Conspiracy* by F. C. Isemonger and J. Slattery, published by the Punjab Government, Lahore, 1921 and *Sedition Committee Report* (Calcutta, 1918), Chapter XI.

27

Page 255 1. Henry W. Nevinson (1856-1941) the noted journalist was in India in 1907-8 as Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*. His experiences in the country were narrated in his work, *New Spirit in India*, published in 1908. Nevinson held Lajpat Rai in high regard and the two became good friends.

Page 258 2. The Government of India decided to make a gift of £100,000,000 (Rs.1,500,000,000) in March 1917 to the British Government as a part of India's contribution to the war effort. This amount was in excess of the annual revenue of the Government of India and raised her national debt by thirty percent. The total war expenditure of the Government of India for the period ending 31 March 1918 was about £ 127,800,000. In addition to this Indian princes and people contributed £ 2,100,C0 in cash.

Page 261 3. The Prices Enqiury Committee was appointed in 1910 by the Government of India to meet the public demand for the investigation of the problem of sharp rise in prices, particularly of food-

grains, since 1905. The Committee was headed by K. L. Datta and submitted its report in 1914. The two main conclusions of Mr. Datta with which the Government of India agreed were : (1) that the extended use of credit had an important effect on the prices and (2) that there was no inflation of the rupee circulation. Independent economic investigators, however, believed that credit circulation was small in India and the rise of prices was connected with the Indian currency system. The Prices Enquiry Committee had underestimated the growth of currency and overestimated the growth of business. See Brij Narain, *Indian Economic Life, Past and Present,* (Lahore 1929), pp. 161-88.

28

Page 281 1. Edwin Samuel Montagu assumed the Office of Secretary of State for India on 20 July 1917.

Page 282 2. The British Indian army surrendered to the Turks at Kut on 29 April 1916, after a siege of 147 days. The army included 2,970 British and about 6,000 Indian troops.

Page 282 3. Austen Chamberlain, Secretry of State for India resigned (20 July 1917) because of the mismanagement of the campaign in Mesopotamia by the Government of India. The entire Mesopotamian expedition was conducted by the Government of India under the general supervision of the 'Home Government' and therefore the Secretary of State had to take responsibility for its failure.

Page 285 4. Mr. Montagu came from a Liverpool family which traced its descent to two Jews of Strelitz in North Germany. They came to England in the middle of the 18th Century.

Page 291 5. A scheme for post-war Indian constitutional reforms was prepared by the Committees set up in December 1915 by the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League at their annual meetings held at Bombay. The scheme was finalized and accepted at Lucknow in December by both the Congress and the League.

The Congress-League Scheme envisaged the enlargement of the Central as well as Provincial Councils and reduction of nominated members to not more than one-fifth of the total. It accepted the principle of separate representation for Muslims in various legislatures and much in excess of their numbers in provinces where they were in a minority. The Scheme provided for full legislative and financial control to the Provincial Legislatures and the power to direct the Provincial Executive governments and similiar right for the Central Legislature except in matters relating to defence, political and foreign affairs. Nineteen Indian elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council had submitted in October 1916 a memorandum to the Government of India setting forth their proposals for reforms. The Congress-League Scheme was an elaboration of these proposals

with the addition of certain special provisions to secure Muslim interests.

Page 291 6. The rough draft of Mr. Gokhale's scheme was prepared two days before his death (19 February 1915) in response to a request from Lord Willingdon, Governor of Bombay, for a statement of minimum reform that would satisfy India. The draft was written for discussions with Pherozshah Mehta and the Agha Khan. It was published in August 1917 and is generally known as 'Political Will and Testament' of Gokhale. The reforms suggested in the draft were of a very 'moderate' character. He asked for full Provincial Autonomy but the Provincial Executive, half British and half Indian in composition, was not to be responsible to the Legislature. For the Central Government he merely suggested the increase in the Indian membership of the Governor-General's Executive Council from one to two and larger number of elected members in the Central Legislature. Gokhale pleaded that the Government of India should be freed from the control of the Secretary of State in fiscal matters and his Council should be abolished. See *Gopal Krishna Gokhale* by T. V. Parvate (Ahmedabad, 1939) pp. 293-97.

Page 291 7. Baron Islington (Sir John Poynder Dickson) was Chairman of the Royal Commission on Indian Public Services, 1912-15 and Under Secretary for India, 1915-18. The Oxford speech referred to by Lajpat Rai was delivered in July 1917. Lord Islington expressed the view that the ideal should be towards the attainment of responsible government for India within the Empire, but it was to be achieved through progressive stages. As an immediate step he suggested the development of Panchayats, District Boards and Municipal Committees, decentralization of powers at the Provincial level and representative control in local government. For constitution of a Provincial Government he suggested an Excutive Council of four members—half Indian and half European in composition and the provision of adequate powers of taxation for the local governments. The Government of India was to be responsible for defence, foreign relations, communications, customs etc. He also suggested liberalization in the composition of the Provincial as well as Central Legislative Councils.

Page 293 8. The duty on import of cotton goods imposed by the Government of India was not approved by the 'Home Government' because it was opposed to the interests of British manufacturers. See above the note on this subject, p. 401-2. Cotton duties were abolished in 1879 by Lord Lytton despite the opposition of the majority of members of his Council.

Page 294 9. The Mesopotamia Commission was appointed in August 1916 to enquire into the operations in Mesopotamia and the causes of the muddle created there. Lord George Hamilton was the Chairman

of the Commission and Josiah Wedgwood was one of the members. The Commission's report was published on 26 June 1917. The facts revealed in the report cast a slur on the organization and management of the campaign in Mesopotamia as well as the whole system of the Government of India.

Page 296 10. Mr. Justice Abdul Rahim was unable to agree to the report of the Commission and wrote a dissenting report. In this he pleaded for holding of simultaneous examinations in India and England without any reservation of posts for either Indians or Europeans. Mr. Abdul Rahim's recommendations had Mr. Gokhale's approval; but the latter died on 19 February 1915 before the report could be finalized.

Page 296 11. The Royal Commission on Public Services was appointed on 5 September 1912 with Lord Islington as Chairman. Its report was submitted on 14 August 1915 (published January 1917) and its major recommendation was to allot 25 percent. of the superior Civil Service posts for Indians. This was not acceptable to Indian public opinion. The implementation of the recommendations was postponed due to the War and by the time it ended those had become obsolete in view of the changed circumstances and the Montagu-Chelmsford Report.

29

Page 304 1. The Moderates who had complete control of the Congress after the Surat split lost their hold over the organization after the re-admission in 1916 of the 'Extremists' under the leadership of B. G. Tilak, and Mrs. Annie Besant. The views of the two groups differed a great deal on the question of Montagu-Chelmsford scheme of constitutional reforms. The Moderates seceded in 1918 and formed their own organization—the National Liberal Federation.

Page 307 2. By the time the Indian National Congress met at Delhi for its annual session in December 1918 under the presidentship of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya the Moderates had already met in a separate All-India Conference at Bombay (November 1918) and welcomed the Montford Reform Scheme. At the Delhi session the 'Extremists' stiffened and the few Moderate leaders who attended this session did not get a patient hearing. The Congress adopted a resolution demanding full self-government in the provinces at its Delhi session.

Page 309 3, Lord Sydenham (Sir George Clarke) was Governor of Bombay from 1907 to 1913. He was a liberal during this period and impressed the Bombay Moderate leaders with his ideas about political advancement of India. Lord Sydenham was later identified with hide-bound Toryism. He headed the Indo-British Association, a group of retired Anglo-Indian officials, formed in October 1917 in London

to combat the new Indian policy of the British Government as announced in the Declaration of August 20, 1917.

Page 310 4. The reference is to Surendranath Banerjea, the great Moderate leader of Bengal.

Page 312 5. Keir Hardie (1856–1915) the founder of the Independent Labour Party in England. He was Labour Member of Parliament in 1892-5, and 1900-1915 and was an ardent supporter of the cause of India. George Lansbury (1859-1940) was another great Labour leader sympathetic to Indian aspirations. He became leader of Opposition in the House of Commons in 1931. Robert Smillie (1857-1940) was a left-wing trade union leader ; he was Member of Parliament from 1923 to 1929.

30

Page 317. 1. The excerpt from Senator Reed's speech has not been reproduced.

32

Page 327 1. Lajpat Rai while in New York was receiving reports of the *Satyagraha* movement led by Mahatma Gandhi against the Rowlatt Act (The Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act, 1919) generally described as a 'Black Act' which was passed by the Indian Legislative Council (18 March 1919) in spite of the unified opposition of the non-official Indian members. This was the first mass movement in India to protest against the repressive policy of the foreign government.

33

Page 329 1. The All-India *Hartal* was observed on 6 April 1919, according to the instructions of Mahatma Gandhi, as a protest against the enactment of Rowlatt Act in spite of strong Indian public opinion against the measure. There was complete suspension of business on that day throughout India and the people observed it as a day of fasting and prayer. In the Punjab the Provincial Government under Michael O'Dwyer adopted strong repressive measures and virtually a reign of terror prevailed in the Province. The atrocities committed by the civil and military authorities at Amritsar, Gujranwala and Kasur during 10-15 April 1919 were unprecedented in the annals of Indo-British history.

Page 330 2. The Indo-British Association was organized in London by a group of retired Anglo-Indian officials under the leadership of Lord Sydenham, immediately after the August 20, 1917 declaration. Its avowed object was the fostering of "the unity and advancement of the Indian people," but in reality it was set up to oppose the new Indian policy of the British Government and to create anti-Indian feelings in England. The Indo-British Association proved to be the

most uncompromising opponent of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme.

Dr. T. M. Nair led a group of Non-Brahmans in Madras who demanded separate representation for their community as had been granted to Muslims under the Morley-Minto Reform Scheme and also provided in the Lucknow Pact of 1916. The Non-Brahman movement, which started in Madras in 1916-17, is believed to have been organized under official inspiration and patronage with the object of weakening the Home Rule movement. The leaders of the Non-Brahman movement demanded the continuance of British rule in preference to what they called 'Brahman rule'. The claim of the Non-Brahman party for separate representation was not accepted by the Montford Report as they formed the majority of population in Madras.

34

Page 335 1. *The Problem of National Education in India* was published in 1920 (London, Allen and Unwin).

35

Page 341. 1. For some details of lynching in U.S.A. see Lajpat Rai, *The United States of America* (Calcutta, 1916), pp. 150-54.

Page 343 2. Lajpat Rai studied the works of Karl Marx and other socialist classics during his stay in New York, particularly after the outbreak of the Russian Revolution in 1917. Though he did not accept Marx's doctrines Lajpat Rai was considerably influenced by his writings.

Page 344 3 Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme of 1918. For a detailed analysis of the scheme see Lajpat Rai's *The Political Future of India* (New York, 1919).

36

Page 349 1. The M.A.O. College at Aligarh was founded in 1875 by Syed Ahmed Khan. His political views made a deep impact on the education imparted in the College.

Page 349 2. The D.A.V. College was started in 1889.

Page 350 3. The Central Hindu College was opened in 1898 and the Banaras Hindu University was created in 1915.

Page 351 4. All of them were the founders of the D.A.V. College and took active interest in the progress of the institution. Lala Lal Chand was the first President of the Managing Committee of the College and Lala Hans Raj was the first Principal. See Lajpat Rai, *Autobiographical Writings* (Delhi, 1965),

Page 352 5. The Bengal National College in Calcutta, was started on 14 August 1906 under the auspices of the National Council of Education.

Page 353 6. The Fergusson College, started by the Deccan Education Society in Poona, in 1885, was named after Sir James Fergusson, the Governor of Bombay, 1880-85. A number of Deccan chiefs and British officials were among its patrons and supporters. Shri Shahu Chhatrapati, Maharaja of Kolhapur, was the first President of the Deccan Education Society.

Page 253 7. Gurukula Kangri was started by Munshi Ram in 1902 with the object of imparting education according to the system advocated by Swami Dayanand.

Page 353 8. Poet Tagore started on 22 December 1901 the Bolpur Brahmacharya Ashram which gradually developed into Santiniketan University.

Page 354 9. The National Council of Education of Bengal was founded in 1906 and its most notable achievement was the establishment of the Bengal National College and School at Calcutta. The institution became very popular in the days of the Swadeshi Movement, but the interest in it began to decline and by 1916-17 not a single student cared to seek admission to it. The repressive policy of the Government during 1908-10 was responsible to a considersble extent for the decline in its popularity and the National Council could not maintain very long its revolutionary enthusiasm.

Page 355 10. The British bureaucracy was quite suspicious about the objects of the Gurukula at Kangri. Sir James Meston, Governor of the United Provinces, 1912-18, visited the Gurukula on 6 March 1913. and declared it to "be an ideal educational institution". Lord Hardinge, Governor-General of India, 1910-16, followed a policy of conciliation towards the Arya Samaj.

38

Page 390 1. Lajpat Rai arrived in New York from England on 21 November 1914. On 3 July 1915 he left San Francisco for Japan and after a stay of about six months there he returned to U.S.A. on 27 December 1915. He reached New York on 3 May 1916. Lajpat Rai, *Autobiographical Writings* (Delhi, 1965), pp. 197, 206, 212, 214.

Page 391 2. *The United States of America—A Hindu's Impressions and a Study* (R. Chatterjee, Calcutta, 1916). The book had been serialized earlier in the *Modern Review* in 1915.

3. These articles appeared in the *Modern Review* in 1915 and reprinted in *Evolution of Japan and other Papers* (*Modern Review*, Calcutta, n. d.)

Page 391 4. Ramchandra, the leader of the Ghadr party in San Francisco, gave $ 600 to Lajpat Rai. *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 205.

Page 392 5. Professor Arthur U. Pope, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, at the University of California, Berkeley.

6 Walter Lippmann, the noted journalist, who was then on the staff of the *New Republic*, a New York weekly.

7. Harold Joseph Laski, the noted political scientist and leader of the Brirish Labour Party. He was Lecturer in the McGill University, 1914-16 and was at Harvard, 1916-20.

Page 392 8. Ben W. Huebsch was a liberal and took up publications to support causes. *England's Debt to India* was published by him in 1917.

Page 393 9 Oswald Garrison Villard, the liberal Editor of the *Nation* (New York) was a friend of Lala Lajpat Rai and helped the Indian leader in his work in U.S.A. Apart from accepting Lajpat Rai's writings for the *Nation* Villard assisted him in getting access to the *New York Evening Post*.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

SURENDRANATH BANERJEA. Born on 10 November 1848; went to England in 1868 to compete for the Indian Civil Service; entered the Indian Civil Service, 1869; Assistant Magistrate Sylhet, 1871; left service, 1874; Professor of English at the Metropolitan Institution of Calcutta, 1875; founded the Indian Assosiation, 1876; led the agitation against the Government's new regulation lowering the age limit for the Indian Civil Service Examination, 1877; joined the Congress in 1886 and was its President in 1895 and 1902; was one of the most eminent Moderate leaders of India; was a member of the Bengal Legislative Council for eight successive years; Member Imperial Legislative Council, 1913-20; President of the Moderate Conference, 1918; a journalist of repute and Editor of the *Bengalee* for many years; Member of the Franchise Committee on Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme, 1918; Member Bengal Legislative Council and Minister of Government of Bengal in charge of Local Self-government and Public Health under the reform scheme, 1921; wrote his autobiography, *Nation in the Making*; died on 6 August 1925.

ANNIE BESANT (MRS.). Theosophist, educationist and politician, born on 10 October 1847 in London; became an atheist and joined Free Thought Society, 1874; worked on the staff of the *National Reformer*, 1874-76; Vice-President National Secular Society; joined Fabian Society, 1885; converted to Theosophy under the influence of Madam Blavatsky, 1889; came to India on behalf of Theosophical Society, 1893, worked for the cause of Indian women and education, founded the Central Hindu College, Banaras, 1898 and a Girls School, 1904; President of Theosophical Society, 1907-33; became active in Indian politics, 1914; founded the Weekly *Commonweal*, 1914 and *New India*, 1914; started the Home Rule League for India, 1 September 1916; interned by the Madras Government on account of her political activities, 1917; President of the Indian National Congress, Calcutta, 1917; left the Congress on account of differences on the question of non-co-operation under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi; founded the Weekly *United India* in England and also published an overseas edition of *New India*; organized a series of conferences and published pamphlets on self-determination and self-government, 1924-29; died on 20 September 1933; publications include: *England, India and Afghanistan* (1878); *Religious Problem of India* (1909); *How India Wrought for Freedom*, (1915); *India, a Nation—a Plea for Indian Self-Government* (1917); *Wake up India—a Plea for Social Reform* (1918), *Problems of Reconstruction* (1919) and *India, Bond or Free—A World Problem* (1926).

MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI. The most distinguished Indian political leader and social reformer; born on 2 October 1869 at Porbandar; educated at Rajkot, matriculated in 1887; left for England in 1888, called to the bar (Inner Temple), 1891; in South Africa from 1893 to 1914,

where he practised law and led the Indian community to fight racial discrimination, founded the Natal Indian Congress, 1894; organized opposition against the 'Registration of Asiatics' Bill which became law in 1907; developed the technique of 'passive resistance' or *Satyagraha* and secured compromise agreement with Smuts; returned to India in January 1915; established *Satyagraha Ashram* at Sabarmati (Ahmedabad); led the Champaran (Bihar) *Satyagraha*, 1917 , conducted recruitment campaign, 1918 ; became very active in opposition to the Rowlatt Act, 1919 and organized an All-India *Hartal* on 6 April 1919 : worked for Non-co-operation movement to protest against government repression in the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs and secured the acceptance of the Indian National Congress for Non-co-operation, 1920; suspended Civil Disobedience movement on outbreak of violence at Chauri Chaura (U P.); imprisoned for sedition, 1922-24 , undertook fast for Hindu-Muslim unity, 1924 ; withdrew from politics temporarily and devoted his time to constructive work and removal of untouchability and promotion of *Khadi*; led the Salt *Satyagraha* movement and marched to Dandi, imprisoned in 1930; released to negotiate with Lord Irwin, Gandhi-Irwin Pact, 1931 . attended the second Round Table Conference in London, 1931 ; returned to India and imprisoned ; fasted to oppose separate electorates for the depressed classes as provided in Ramsay Macdonald's Communal Award and secured Poona Pact which provided for joint electorates, 1932 ; retired from Congress to work for the removal of untouchability, 1934 ; resumed leadership of the Congress, 1940; arrested after adoption of 'Quit India' resolution by the Congress, 9 August 1942 ; released on account of ill-health, 6 May 1944; held talks with M.A. Jinnah but failed to achieve agreement with him, 1944; deeply perturbed over communal riots and worked for communal harmony, 1946-47 ; shot dead by a Hindu fanatic, 30 January 1948.

ARABINDA GHOSH. Born in Calcutta on 15 August 1872; went to England at the age of seven; educated privately and at St. Paul in London, (1884-89) where he acquired proficiency in classics and won several prizes; joined King's College, Cambridge, on a scholarship, 1890; qualified for the Indian Civil Service but was not selected as he failed in riding test; joined Baroda State Service in 1893 and continued there up to 1906; was Professor of English in Baroda College in 1900; entered politics after the partition of Bengal; was active in the National Education Movement in Bengal and was the Principal of the National College, Calcutta ; was one of the chief leaders of the Extremists ; was prosecuted in the Alipore bomb case but acquitted; left politics on release and retired to Pondicherry and devoted himself to spiritual and yogic exercises ; died in 1950.

GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE. Born at Kolhapur on 9 May 1866; educated at Elphinstone College Bombay ; joined the Deccan Education Society and became a Professor of History and Political Science in Fergusson College and devoted himself to educational work for 20 years ; was the editor of the *Quarterly Journal of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha* in 1887 and Honorary Secretary of the Deccan Sabha ; actively indentified with the Indian National Congress ; was Secretary of the Bombay Provincial Conference for four years

and of the Indian National Congress Session Poona in 1895 ; was an eminent exponent of Moderate politics in India ; President of the Congress Session, 1905, gave evidence before the Welby Commission, 1897 ; elected to Bombay Legislative Council, represented Bombay on the Supreme Legislative Council, 1902 ; re-elected successively ; opposed Curzon's Universities Bill ; Congress delegate to England in 1905 and 1908 ; Member, Royal Commission on Public Services in India, 1912 ; died on 19 February 1915.

MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA. Born at Allahabad on 25 December 1862 ; educated at the Muir Central College, Allahabad ; graduated in 1884 ; LL.B. from Allahabad, 1892; school master, 1885-87 ; edited *Hindustani*, 1887-89, *The Indian Union*, 1889-92, the *Abhyudaya*, 1907-09 ; Member Provincial Legislative Council, 1902-12 ; President, Indian National Congress in 1909, 1918 and 1933 ; Member, Imperial Legislative Council, 1910-20 ; Member, Legislative Assembly, 1924-30 ; founded the Nationalist Party in 1926 ; worked for the establishment of the Banaras Hindu University and was its Vice-Chancellor, 1919-39 ; President of the Hindu Mahasabha, 1923, 1924 and 1936 ; was President of the Sanatan Dharam Mahasabha ; a loyal Congressman throughout his life ; was a member of the Indian Industrial Commission, 1916; attended the Second Round Table Conference, 1931 ; died on 12 November 1946.

PHEROZSHAH MEHTA. Born on 4 August 1845 in a merchant family of Bombay ; educated at Elphinstone College ; graduated in 1864 ; went on a scholarship to England ; called to the bar in 1868 ; was a successful lawyer in India ; entered Bombay Corporation in 1872 and was active there for over thirty-eight years ; was its Chairman thrice ; was one of the most influential Moderates ; was one of the founders of the Bombay Presidency Association ; member of the Bombay Legislative Council, 1886 ; one of the founders of the Indian National Congress and presided at the Calcutta Session in 1890 ; Chairman of the Reception Committee, Indian National Congress at Bombay, 1889 and 1904 ; elected to the Bombay Legislative Council in 1892 and time and again after that ; was an active member of the Bombay University Senate ; President, Bombay Provincial Conference, 1892 ; gave evidence before many Public Commissions ; was intimately connected with the Bombay mill industry ; appointed Vice-Chancellor Bombay University towards the end of his life ; died on 5 November 1915.

MUNSHI RAM (SWAMI SHRADDHANAND). Born at Jullundur in 1856 ; educated mostly at Banaras ; came into contact with Swami Dayanand and became an Arya Samajist ; practised as a lawyer from 1885 to 1902 ; was active in the Arya Samaj work and was the leader of the 'Mahatma' party in the Samaj split ; founded the Gurukula Kangri (1904) of which he was the Governor till 1921 ; took *Sanyas* in 1917 ; organised famine relief work in Garhwal in 1918 ; was Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Amritsar Congress Session in 1919 ; arrested in September 1922 in Guru-ka-Bagh agitation and jailed ; was an active promoter of the *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* movements after his release ; worked for the uplift of the depressed classes

and set up the *Dalit Uddhar Sabha*; wrote his autobiography *Kalyan Marg ka Pathik* in Mianwali Jail; assassinated on 23 December 1926.

MAHADEV GOVIND RANADE. Indian social reformer, historian and economist; born on 18 January 1842 in a Chitpavan Brahman family; early education at Kolhapur and then at Elphinstone Institution, Bombay, where he won distinction as a student; B.A. 1862; M.A. 1864; started his career in the Bombay Education Department as a Marathi Translator, 1866-68; Professor of English in Elphinstone College, 1868-71; joined Bombay Judicial Service in 1871, filled successively the positions of Reporter in High Court, Subordinate Judge, Presidency Magistrate, Judge of Poona Small Cause Court, Special Judge under the Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act, and finally became a Judge of the Bombay High Court in 1893; actively associated with the Bombay *Prarthana Samaj* and *the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha* which he established at Nasik; started the *Sarvajanik Sabha's Quarterly Journal* in April 1878 and frequently contributed to it; Law Member Bombay Legislative Council, 1885; Member of the Finance Committee on behalf of Bombay Government, 1886-87; a prominent member of the Bombay University Senate for many years; a strong protagonist of Hindu social reform, he was actively associated with the National Social Conference, 1887-1901; was a pioneer in the field of Indian economic studies and was the first economist to lay the conditions of economic progress for India; was a keen student of Maratha history and made use of the original Marathi documents in his writings; died on 16 January 1901; Publications include: *Essays on Indian Economics* (1899), *Rise of Mahratta Power*, (1900).

SYED AHMED KHAN. Born on 17 October 1817; entered government service in 1837 and rose to be a Subordinate Judge in the North-Western Provinces; rendered faithful services to the British during the Mutiny at Bijnor, saving their lives; wrote a pamphlet in Urdu on the *Causes of the Mutiny*; was devoted to antiquarian research and was a member of the Royal Asiatic Society; founded a Translation Society at Ghazipur in 1864 (afterwards moved to Aligarh) and had several valuable English works translated into Urdu; started *Aligarh Gazette* in 1866 and *Tahzib-al-Akhlaq* (Social Reformer) in 1870; retired from government service in 1876; wrote a reply to Sir W. W. Hunter's work on the *Indian Mussalmans*; founded the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, 1875; was a member of the Legislative Council of North-Western Provinces and an additional member of the Governor-General's Legislative Council, 1878-82; was knighted in 1888; devoted his whole energy and means to the promotion of Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh; opposed the Indian National Congress and advised Muslims not to join it; died on 27 March 1898.

BALGANGADHAR TILAK. Born on 23 July 1856 in Ratnagiri district in a Chitpavan family; matriculated in 1872 and joined the Deccan College; graduated in 1876 and passed the law examination in 1880; collaborated in promoting the New English School at Poona in 1880; started the *Kesri* and *Mahratta* along with others in 1881; one of the founders of the Deccan Education Society and Fergusson College, 1885; taught Mathematics

in the College and resigned on account of differences with Gokhale ; started the Shivaji and Ganesh festivals ; worked for famine and plague relief in 1896 and 1897 ; sentenced to 18 months hard labour in the first sedition trial in July 1897 ; was the leader of the 'Extremists' at the Banaras and the Calcutta Congress ; left the Congress after the split at Surat in 1907 ; sentenced to six years in the second sedition trial on 22 July 1908 ; released in June 1914 ; started the Home Rule League, 1916 ; went to England in 1918 with the Home Rule League deputation ; appeared before the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Reforms ; returned to India on 27 November 1919 ; enunciated the idea of responsive co-operation at the Amritsar Congress session, died on 1 August 1920. His publications : *Gita Rahasya, The Arctic Home of the Vedas,* and the *Orion.*

INDEX